

SUMMER, 1954

RELIGION IN LIFE

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

A Christian Quarterly

OF OPINION AND DISCUSSION.

CONTENTS

Christ the Hope of the World

What Has History to Say?

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE, REINHOLD NIEBUHR, F. ERNEST STOEFLER

Denominations or Union?.....	JOHN M. VERSTEEG
Biblical Authority in Contemporary Protestantism.....	CHARLES HARVEY ARNOLD
"Jesus Said".....	WILLARD L. SPERRY
Is Religious Education Obsolete?.....	HOWARD CRIMES
Theological Gamesmanship II.....	ROBERT MC Afee BROWN
Martin Buber at Seventy-Five.....	MAURICE S. FRIEDMAN
Early Methodism and the Quakers.....	JOHN C. BOWMER
The Credentials of a Cleric.....	HERBERT A. KECK
Operation Bootstrap: The Task of the Church in Indonesia.....	WINBURN T. THOMAS
Clarence Tucker Craig, 1895-1953.....	LUTHER A. WEIGLE
Book Reviews	
Book Notices	

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

EDITORIAL BOARD

NOLAN B. HARMON, *Editor-in-Chief*
ERMINIE HUNTRESS LANTERO, *Assistant Editor*

JOHN BAILLIE

GERALD CRAGG

KENNETH S. LATOURETTE

ROBBINS W. BARSTOW

STANLEY R. HOPPER

G. ASHTON OLDHAM

SAMUEL McCREA CAVERT

JOHN KNOX

W. NORMAN PITTENGER

LESLIE F. CHURCH

RUSSELL H. STAFFORD

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Henry Sloane Coffin

Harold C. Phillips

Leslie D. Weatherhead

Joseph Haroutunian

Alexander C. Purdy

Theodore O. Wedel

Walter G. Muelder

Richard C. Raines

Luther A. Weigle

Robert H. Nichols

Edward T. Ramsdell

R. Frederick West

Carl C. Rasmussen

Religion in Life is published quarterly by the Abingdon Press at \$1.25 per copy. Subscription price, \$4.00 per year in the United States and possessions and Mexico; Canada, postage 15 cents per year additional; other foreign postage 20 cents per year additional.

Publication office, 310 Broadway, Nashville 2, Tennessee. Editorial office, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, New York. Entered as Second Class Matter, August 22, 1942, at the post office in Nashville, Tennessee, under Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided in Section 1103, Act of Oct. 3, 1917, authorized March 16, 1922.

L
A

VOL

Chr

V

R

Deno

Bibli

"Jes

Is R

Theo

Mar

Early

The

Open

Clar

Book

Book

Copyr

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY of opinion and discussion

VOL. XXIII

Summer, 1954

No. 3

CONTENTS

Christ the Hope of the World	323
<i>What Has History to Say?</i>	
KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE, REINHOLD NIEBUHR, F. ERNEST STOEFLER	
Denominations or Union?	JOHN M. VERSTEEG 352
Biblical Authority in Contemporary Protestantism . . .	CHARLES HARVEY ARNOLD 363
"Jesus Said"	WILLARD L. SPERRY 375
Is Religious Education Obsolete?	HOWARD GRIMES 384
Theological Gamesmanship II	ROBERT MC ATEE BROWN 396
Martin Buber at Seventy-Five	MAURICE S. FRIEDMAN 405
Early Methodism and the Quakers	JOHN C. BOWMER 418
The Credentials of a Cleric	HERBERT A. KECK 430
Operation Bootstrap: The Task of the Church in Indonesia	
	WINBURN T. THOMAS 438
Clarence Tucker Craig, 1895-1953	LUTHER A. WEIGLE 451
Book Reviews	458
Book Notices	480

"A Dangerous Pentecost"

HALFORD E. LUCCOCK

THERE are many who are indulging the conventional longing for Pentecost, who would give scant welcome to the real thing were it suddenly to appear. Max Beerbohm has spoken for a large company of us when he confessed, "I am a Tory Anarchist. I am willing for anyone to do anything he wishes, as long as it does not disturb the things to which I have been accustomed." We could all be anarchists with that reservation! It is easy to be a Christian with that reservation. It is easy, and on the whole rather a satisfying thing, emotionally, to yearn for the coming of fresh tides of Pentecostal power—with the proviso, of course, that nothing to which we have been accustomed shall be disturbed!

All of this is just another reminder that it is a terribly serious thing to pray. The real seriousness comes not in the possibility that our prayer may not be answered; the appallingly serious thing is that it *may be* answered. A real answer to prayer will usually let us in for more than we ask. . . . The only way in which a prayer for strength can be answered is by putting a man into a place where he will have to struggle. . . .

The point most often forgotten is this: *the disciples received the Pentecostal power when they faced the Pentecostal task.* Pentecost began before they went to the upper room. It began when they ceased gazing upward into the skies on Mt. Olivet and made their way back to Jerusalem. In doing that they faced their world of need, of danger, of opportunity.

—*Marching Off the Map*, by Halford E. Luccock. Harper & Brothers, 1952. p. 145f. Used by permission.

"Christ the Hope of the World"

What Has History to Say?

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE

CHRIST THE HOPE OF THE WORLD." That is the theme of the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches. In one form or another it has been central in the programs of many church bodies in recent years. What light, if any, do the facts of history shed on it? Do they confirm it or do they deny it? Or, perchance, do they give an uncertain sound and neither fully support nor completely undercut it? In preparation for Evanston resort has been made, and rightly, to the theologians. Theology must certainly be heard. But theology as such cannot give the full answer. Neither can history. But history must be examined. That, thus far, has been done only incidentally in the materials prepared for the Assembly, nor has provision been made for it on the program. It is to be hoped that in the continuation of the ecumenical conversation of which the Assembly and the commissions leading to it are a stage, the evidence of history will be sought.

The forthcoming Assembly cannot say the final word on the great affirmation which is its theme. Nor can many Assemblies do so. At best it and they can merely set forward Christian thinking and action. In the meantime, there may be value for both thinking and action in bringing to the ecumenical conversation some reflections on possible contributions from history. In so short an article as this must be, we cannot enter into an extended discussion. We may, however, be able to call attention to certain facets of the question and to a few of the facts of which account must be taken in further studies.

I

First of all, we may note that in recent years attempts at philosophies of history have been for many an engrossing study. Men have asked whether there are patterns in history and if so, what the patterns are.

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE, Ph.D., LL.D., S.T.D., is Sterling Professor Emeritus of Missions and Oriental History at Yale University Divinity School; author of the seven-volume *History of the Expansion of Christianity*, two volumes on *The Chinese: Their History and Culture*, and recent works on American policy in the Far East.

Currently the most controversial of the philosophies of history is that developed by Karl Marx and elaborated and modified by those who see in him the great pioneer. Outstanding among them have been Lenin, Stalin, and Mao Tse-tung. Among other notable philosophies of history of the present century are those associated with the names of Spengler, Toynbee, and among a more limited circle, those of Croce and Collingwood. Convinced Christians have been addressing themselves to the subject. Here the list of contemporary studies is being rapidly lengthened. Merely to name them would entail a bibliography which would be fully as long as this article.

Moreover, we need to remind ourselves that the question whether there is a pattern in the stream of history and if so, whether that pattern has meaning, is by no means new. It has been asked across the centuries and in more than one cultural tradition. It has fascinated many in China. It has been raised in Buddhism. The Old Testament contains vivid examples. The Greeks struggled with it. Again and again Christians have addressed themselves to it, never more notably than in Augustine's *City of God*. In the nineteenth century Hegel's philosophy of history had wide repercussions which are still heard.

In the next place, we must point out that when the Christian attempts to attain to an understanding of history, he is sobered by the demand that he do so from a unique and revolutionary perspective. He is warned that God's ways are not man's ways, nor God's thoughts man's thoughts. He is told that unless a man is born again he cannot even see the kingdom of God, that is, that he cannot recognize the rule of God or the fashion in which God is working. At the very outset of his ministry, the substance of what Jesus was preaching was summed up in the brief proclamation: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the Gospel." A key word is "repent." The Greek word thus translated also means "change your mind," or in other words, "get a new perspective." That seems to agree with other declarations that if we are to see God in history we must have quite a different outlook from that usually achieved by men. What is required is vividly described as a new birth. The new birth comes through God's Spirit and takes place in those who will co-operate with God. Men are commanded to "change their minds" and to "become as little children," learning afresh from a new beginning. But that new birth is not only through "water," which is by man's effort, but also through "the Spirit," which is the divine initiative.

As if to confirm this, we have the record of the Incarnation, of the

Eternal Word becoming flesh in "a little baby thing which made a woman cry," of a youth in an obscure village, and of a brief public ministry in which little or no thought appears to have been given to insuring permanence to what had been begun by committing it to writing or by a continuing organization. And to the world it all seemed to come to a weak and humiliating end on a cross. Yet Paul declared that in the Cross "the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men." But that was a first-century declaration. Have the subsequent centuries justified it?

As we seek data to answer this question we do well to remember that much, perhaps most of them, will elude us. If God's ways are not our ways or his thoughts our thoughts, if a complete reorientation is needed to discern God's rule in history, and if what, judged from human standards, is the weakness and foolishness of God becomes in fact the strength and the wisdom of God—then the probability is that the working of God's power and wisdom in the world will not be prominent in the records to which the historian is perforce confined as he seeks to reconstruct the past. What is deemed important by men and therefore is conserved in monuments or written documents may not, from the standpoint of God as seen in the Incarnation and the Cross, be the most significant. That which really reveals God's reign and confirms the conviction that Christ is the hope of the world may not be detectable in what has escaped the tooth of time. Even in our own day, how little could be gathered from our daily press, our weekly and monthly periodicals, the files in government offices, and most of the books which fill our library shelves! But it is to these that the historian is largely restricted. To those who a century or more hence seek to reconstruct our times, these will be their chief sources. Yet those who are dependent on them may miss what from God's standpoint is of major moment.

When we have our attention called to this fact, most of us can recall corroborative evidence. We remember unselfish, radiant lives, made such because of Christ. In their communities and among their neighbors they were both salt and light. Yet beyond a brief obituary notice the press did not mention them, such letters as they left at best give only an imperfect picture, and for the most part disappear; within a generation or two they are forgotten, even by their descendants. Yet it is chiefly through them that the transforming work of Christ goes forward.

We must always remember, moreover, that history can never tell the full story of what as Christians we believe that God has done and continues

to do through Christ. After Good Friday came Easter morning, and after Easter the Ascension. Our confident hope is that the new life begun within history through Christ is not confined to this bourne of time and place. That life goes on in community. There is the Church triumphant as well as the Church militant. Without it history is incomplete and not fully intelligible. Yet into that larger reach beyond the grave the historian, as historian, cannot penetrate. If we are true to the gospel, when we speak of "Christ the hope of the world," we have that dimension in mind. But here, except to point out the existence of that hope and the place which it has had in the lives of untold millions, the historian cannot help us.

II

Yet, judged by such records as are available to us, no life ever lived on this planet has had as much influence *this* side of the grave, as has that which seemed to end in futility on Calvary. No historian whom prejudice or ignorance has not made blind can or would deny this to be fact. This is apparent even from such gross data as are available to us and without the ephemeral written remains of the highly significant lives of which we have spoken.

Moreover, that influence is growing. Never before has it been so widely spread as in our day. It has become global. It is by no means dominant, but increasingly it permeates all aspects and geographic areas of life.

During the last four and a half centuries the spread of Christianity has been chiefly through the peoples and the culture of Western Europe. Here is one of the most provocative questions with which the historian has to deal. Why has Western civilization been more dynamic than that of any other part of the world? No other culture has so profoundly affected all mankind. Indeed, no other has impinged, even lightly, upon all the human race. From Western European peoples have issued those forces which are working revolutions among all peoples, including themselves. It has been among them that science, the machine, the industrial revolution, and the associated modern industrial mass society have had their origins and their chief development. It is among Western European peoples that the political and social ideals, ideologies, and institutions which are reshaping the world had their rise and their initial formulations and expressions. From them they have spread throughout the world. That is true of democracy as we of the United States understand it, of nationalism, of Socialism, and of Communism.

In Western civilization the kind of modern secularism which threatens all religion had its beginning. There it has had some of its chief manifestations, and from there it has spread throughout much of the world. It is by the machines first developed by Western European peoples, and among them are included their descendants in the United States, that the wars of the present century have been fought. Moreover, it is among Western European peoples that modern medicine and surgery with their accompaniments of public health and the nursing profession have had their beginnings and their major accomplishments. Among them, too, have been seen the chief efforts to bring mankind together in friendly co-operation and to rid the world of war. Among them and from them have arisen and spread the most outstanding efforts for the relief and cure of human suffering, whether chronic as in mental illnesses and cancer, or from wars and their aftermath.

Is Christ responsible, even if only in association with other factors, for this dynamic quality in Western civilization? If so, can he be held at all accountable for the morally mixed character of that civilization? What do answers to these questions have to add to the consideration of "Christ the hope of the world"? Some must be in part conjectural, but others can be fairly positive and assured.

Among the conjectural answers is that a clue to the dynamism of Western civilization is to be found in Christ. In the seventh and the eighth centuries the Arabs, inspired by Islam, overran about half the Mediterranean world. In the areas which they controlled they became heirs of Greek and Roman culture. The combination of that culture with Islam gave rise to a notable civilization, rich in art, philosophy, and the foreshadowings of modern science. But that civilization became stagnant. There may be more than a coincidence in the fact that the first translations of the Greek philosophers into Arabic were made by Christians for their Arab masters, that at least some of what we think of as Arab architecture was first produced by Christian craftsmen, and that as the Christian communities in the Arab world dwindled the creative impulse in Arab culture declined.

Northwest of the Mediterranean, where Western European culture developed, the peoples were also heirs of Greek and Roman culture and this, too, came to them through Christian channels. But here Christianity survived and, after recovery from the barbarian invasions, it displayed renewed vitality which blossomed forth in universities, fresh monastic orders, the theologies of the schoolmen, and later, in the Protestant Refor-

mation and the Evangelical Awakenings. It is conceivable that the dynamism in the culture of Western Europeans is not merely coincident with this vitality in Western Christianity, or does not arise from some cause common to both, but is the product of that vitality.

It seems clear that Christ had more influence in Western than in Eastern Europe. From this may come the greater dynamism in Western Europe. The reason for that may be found in the fact that he had freer course among Western Europeans. Most of the peoples of Eastern Europe assumed the Christian name. Indeed, for some centuries most of the chief centers of Christianity were in Western Asia and Southeastern Europe, with Constantinople outstanding. However, it was here that the Roman Empire longest survived without a break, and with it the tradition of the subservience of the religion to the state. It was the East, moreover, which felt the full impact of Islam, borne first by the Arabs and latterly by the Turks. Eventually it was overwhelmed by Islam. Latterly Eastern Christianity was strongest in Russia, where it was kept subordinate to the state and flourished chiefly in monastic and kenotic seclusion from the world.

III

In the dynamism of Western civilization it is clear that two contrasting and opposing drives have been present.

On the one hand, in the Occident some of the hereditary and chronic ills of mankind have attained their largest proportions. Thus with the possible exception of the status of the depressed classes in Hindu India, the Negro slave trade in Africa and Negro slavery in the Americas were the most colossal, in all history, of the many calloused exploitations of one group of mankind by another. Less extensive in the numbers involved but as extensive geographically is the record of the treatment of the Indians in the New World, particularly in the first few decades of the Spanish conquest, but also across succeeding centuries, as seen, for instance, in the wars of the whites and the Indians in the United States.

We must not forget that the course of Western history has been punctuated by wars, that in the present century they have attained the most gigantic dimensions in all time, that this has been through machines and methods devised in the Occident, and that some of the worst destruction has been seen in Europe, the heart of the traditional Christendom. We must also remember the cruel and degrading labor conditions which were among the initial accompaniments of the industrial revolution, and keep before us the slums which still exist in mining areas and in our great

cities, and the deadening effects which the machines have upon those who operate them.

We must also face frankly what many declare to be the de-Christianization of Christendom. A familiar designation of our times is the "post-Christian era." The most spectacular of the forces which is making for the apparent recession of the Christian tide is communism. This, as we all know, was first formulated in "Christian" Paris, Brussels, Cologne, and London by Marx and Engels, especially Marx. Communism was preceded by the French Revolution, and much of the current de-Christianization of France began with that movement and with the intellectuals of the "Enlightenment" who fathered it. We are also aware that communism contains a perverted version of Judeo-Christian apocalypticism, and eschatology from which God has been eliminated, and that the eighteenth-century philosophers dreamed of a secularized *City of God*. In other words, Christianity has contributed to ideologies and movements which are now seeking its destruction.

Fully as dangerous, and possibly more so, have been less spectacular but corrosive forces which are also in part born of Christianity. Among them are scientific theories and discoveries which to some degree were made possible by the belief in an orderly universe drilled into the European mind by theologians of the Middle Ages. Associated with them are the special brand of secularism and what has been called "modern mass society" which arose from the Industrial Revolution, and thus were made possible by science. As a result, millions of Christian ancestry are now either completely divorced from the faith or retain only such ties with it as the conventional use of baptism, confirmation, and Christian rites in marriage and burial.

In contrast with these features of Western history and life which in practice are a denial or perversion of Christianity, is another side of the picture. From Christian faith have come and continue to emerge movements to fight the ills which have been or are prominent in the Occident. Indeed, from no other source have come so many movements to control or eliminate the forces which work against the welfare of mankind. The list is long and we can here give only a few of its more prominent items.

It was through men and women moved and sustained by their Christian faith that the Negro slave trade and Negro slavery were abolished. It was the Christian conscience which wrote into the Laws of the Indies measures to protect the Indians in the Spanish possessions. Indeed, significantly, the outstanding pioneer in that effort, Las Casas, was the first

clergyman ordained in the New World. It is Christians who have taken the lead in striving to make the impact of the Occident upon non-European peoples a blessing rather than a curse. Through them among non-European peoples hundreds of languages have been reduced to writing, thousands of schools and hospitals founded and maintained, medical and nursing professions brought into being, and measures for public health initiated.

By its name and symbol the Red Cross, with its ministry to victims of war and natural disasters, witnesses to its Christian origin; and we do well to recall that it was a young layman of Geneva, Henri Durant, active in the early decades of the Young Men's Christian Associations, who brought it into being.

So, too, Christian faith and daring have been chiefly responsible for the initiation of the League of Nations and its successor, the United Nations. While many in several lands prepared the way for it, but for the resolution of President Wilson the League of Nations would not have been. Outstanding in the motivation which drove Wilson was his Christian conscience, and it was his Christian faith which sustained him. The dreams and labors of thousands, chiefly Christians, prepared the way for the United Nations, the organization which arose after the League of Nations disintegrated. Here, sprung from the Christian faith and arising in that very Occident in which wars have reached their most colossal dimensions, as we have suggested, have been and are the world's most ambitious efforts to unite mankind in the peaceful resolution of disputes between nations and to bring all mankind into collaboration for furthering the welfare of the race.

In addition to what is being attempted through governments, the present century has seen the greatest outpouring in history of private philanthropy for the allaying and removal of suffering and the promotion of the well-being of mankind. Almost all of this is from the Occident and in the majority of instances can be traced to impulses from the Christian faith. The legislation to remedy that exploitation of laborers which was an early fruit of the industrial revolution is traceable, notably in its early stages and in Great Britain, to the Christian conscience.

Over against the seeming de-Christianization of Christendom and the presumed arrival of the "post-Christian era" are manifestations of amazing vitality in the Christian faith. The movements antagonistic to Christianity and the response to them of millions have been paralleled by a vigor in the churches and by frankly Christian enterprises which for geographic

extent have never been equaled. Thus while Karl Marx was writing in London *Das Kapital* with its analysis of the class struggle and its bitter hatreds, in the slums of that very city and three years before the publication of the first volume of that epoch-making book, William Booth organized the Christian Missions which before the death of Marx had grown into the Salvation Army, with an inclusive program for remedying the conditions which were nursing the wrath of Marx.

As the historian looks back across the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries he is impressed by the amazing record of revival and geographic expansion. He notes in the sixteenth century the Protestant and Catholic Reformation. He recalls in the seventeenth century the movements in Britain which issued in the Commonwealth, the nonconforming churches in England, and the Covenanters in Scotland, and he remarks the birth of Pietism in a land recently devastated by the Thirty Years War. In the eighteenth century, as if to counterbalance the emergence of Deism in England and the upheavals of the French Revolution, there were the Evangelical Awakening in Britain, the beginnings of the Sunday School, the inauguration of several of the great Protestant missionary societies, and the Great Awakening in the Thirteen Colonies followed by the Second Great Awakening in what had become the United States.

The nineteenth century witnessed a renewal of the Roman Catholic Church, with the beginning of more new monastic movements and congregations than had been born in any preceding century, the close integration of that Church as a militant body under the direction of the Papacy, and the propagation of its faith among more peoples than had ever known it. The nineteenth century also saw the rise of the tide of faith in Russia through the quickening of old, and the introduction or emergence of new expressions of Christianity.

Even more strikingly, that century was a time when Protestantism blossomed out in many fresh movements, such as the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, the phenomenal expansion of Sunday Schools and Bible societies, the Inner Mission in Germany and Scandinavia, the beginnings of the Ecumenical Movement, and a breathtaking missionary movement by which, from being a narrowly regional faith,—confined almost entirely to Northwestern Europe, the British Isles, and a few enclaves on the eastern shore of North America, the tip of South Africa, the West and East Indies, and India—it became worldwide. In spite of the wars and revolutions of the present century and the aggres-

sively anti-Christian movements, never before has Christianity or any other religion been as widely spread, as deeply rooted among so many peoples, and with as extensive an influence upon the life of mankind as it is today.

IV

What does all this mean as we contemplate the affirmation: "Christ the hope of the world"? It gives us a picture of perplexing apparent contradictions. We see movements and forces which have originated in Western "Christendom" which are the opposite of what is upheld by Christian ethics, and several of which are tragic perversions of Christian hopes and convictions, which mar the lives of untold millions. Some of them are in part the outgrowth of Christianity. Through the expansion of European peoples and their culture they have made themselves felt the world around. Were they all the story, one might well think of Christ not as the hope of the world but as its despair.

We might quote cynically the lines which came out of World War I: "Two thousand years of holy mass, and we have come to poison gas." Yet this should not surprise us. We should remember that the Incarnation was the occasion of the crucifixion. It provoked the official representatives of what until then were the highest religion and the most powerful empire, to the greatest crime which men have ever committed. But we also see issuing from Christ movements which not only have sought to counter the historic chronic ills and evils of men, but which have also endeavored positively to bring to a closer approximation to his standards both individuals and man's collective life.

We are reminded of the prediction of Christ which pictured the Church as an army attacking a city. The Church is not on the defensive, and Christ declared that "the gates of hell," or to use another translation, "the powers of death," shall not prevail against it. By striking pulsations of advance, retreat, and advance, judged from the scope of the entire human scene and the course of history to our day, Christ and his Church are making themselves more and more felt and have never been more potent than in our time. We can be clear that if there is hope anywhere it is in Christ. We see it not only in movements which affect men in the mass, but also, and more significantly if less spectacularly, in individuals. It is through lives made radiant through Christ that these movements begin, but even more it is these lives, most of them known to only a few, who are evidence of the power of God who has revealed himself in Christ and con-

tinues in the world through that Spirit "who proceedeth from the Father and the Son."

History gives us no assurance that these contradictions are to end. So far as the scroll of history has thus far been unrolled it seems to indicate that they are, rather, to be heightened. Yet it does disclose Christ as the continuing source of movements which are affecting more and more of mankind and of lives which are, as he said they would be, the salt of the earth and the light of the world.

From Reinhold Niebuhr

I

IT IS SIGNIFICANT for the chasm which separates America from the Continent that so eminent a Christian historian as Professor Latourette should interpret the theme of the Second General Assembly of the World Council of Churches, to be held in Evanston this summer, as implying that Jesus Christ is the "hope of the world" in the sense that the Christian faith offers the world some hope of a gradual triumph of the "values" embodied in Christ in actual human history.

For the continental theologians, who were chiefly responsible for formulating the theme, chose it, I am persuaded, because they thought it most strategic to challenge precisely the form of historical optimism which Professor Latourette elaborates in his article. They regard such a hope as a form of secularism, and they replace it with a biblical account of Christ's second coming—which in America will be regarded as a purely illusory projection of hope to the "end of history," which cultured Christians had left to literalistic sects to claim as their article of faith. The average intelligent Protestant Christian will interpret the phrase "Jesus Christ the only hope of the world" in exactly the same way as Professor Latourette has interpreted it.

I think this whole misunderstanding proves that the definition of Christian hope is not the best way of consolidating an ecumenical consensus or of challenging the remnants of "secularism" which the Continent suspects in the Christian thought of the "Anglo-Saxon" world. The "secular" element in Christian thought, particularly in America, is of course the identification of Christian hope with the idea of progress.

Professor Latourette assumes it to be his function to interpret Christian hope in this way. But he is also an honest historian and he therefore has great difficulty in fulfilling his assignment. Thus he calls attention to the spread of Christianity from the Western world to the entire globe; but he is forced to concede that this phenomenon is balanced by the secularization of Western Christendom and that a part of this secularization includes the emergence of the demonic secular religion of Communism.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, M.A., D.D., LL.D., is William E. Dodge Jr. Professor of Applied Christianity, and Dean of the Faculty, at Union Theological Seminary, New York City. Among his books are *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, *Christianity and Power Politics*, *Faith and History*, and *The Irony of American History*.

He also faithfully records that the dynamic of Western civilization is the fruit of Christianity's affirmation of man's historic existence, but that this dynamic has both evil and good fruits. This latter admission contains the refutation of any simple identification of Christian hope with the idea of historical progress. It is very plain that human history is open to endless possibilities of both good and evil, because human freedom is radical and real. There is therefore the possibility that any historic development of human freedom will result in both destructiveness and increased creativity.

In the report of the World Council Advisory Commission on the central theme, this character of human history is described in the following words:

The long history of the world which He created and sustains from day to day and for the sake of which He sent His Son, is not rendered meaningless by the coming of His Kingdom. Nor on the other hand is His Kingdom simply the final outcome of the world's history. There is no straight line from the labors of men to His Kingdom. He rejects that history of which man fancies himself to be the center, creator and lord. He accepts that history of which the beginning, middle and end He Himself fixes.

In short, the theme of the General Assembly elaborates a New Testament hope according to which the culmination of history is not within history itself but at its end. History is recognized as being problematic to the end. It solves no human problems but rather accentuates every human problem.

Therefore from the standpoint from which the Christian hope has been defined by the Advisory Commission, some of the evidence adduced by Professor Latourette is rather irrelevant: that Christian influence entered the formation of the League of Nations, that it was powerful in the organization of the Red Cross, that the Salvation Army responded to the needs of the poor which were driven to revolt by Marxist dogmas, that it was responsible for the abolition of slavery and for the organization of YMCAs. Some of these assertions are highly problematic, incidentally. Wilson may have been a Christian, but the dream of a world community which brought forth the League of Nations is a Renaissance, rather than a specifically Christian, achievement. However great may be achievements of the Salvation Army, they do not seriously challenge or abate the evils of world-wide communism. In most of the achievements which Professor Latourette enumerates, secular idealism co-operated with more distinctively Christian idealism in bringing them about. This is true of the

abolition movement and of the growth of political democracy. One therefore feels it a little pretentious to assert that "It is through lives made radiant through Christ that these movements begin."

One must be even more hesitant to affirm with Professor Latourette that "judged from the scope of the entire human scene and the course of history to our day, Christ and his Church are making themselves more and more felt and have never been more potent than in our time." Perhaps it is the phrase "Christ and his Church" which makes the assertion so dubious. We are convinced that the Sovereign Lord of history has been supremely revealed in Christ. We can detect proofs of this Lord's sovereignty in the whole course of history, particularly when we see him making the wrath of man to praise him; and when we see movements not specifically Christian and far beyond the confines of the church, serving providentially to do God's will. But this vision of a divine Lord is obscured when we say "Christ and his Church" and particularly when we make the claim that the two, "Christ and his Church," are becoming increasingly potent in our day. The claim that the Church is becoming increasingly potent in our day is certainly open to doubt. But it is even more dubious to link "Christ and his Church" in this way. For thus we make the glory of Christ dependent upon the weak human instrument of the Church.

Let us take just one example from current history: the struggle with communism, and previously with fascism. In each of these struggles some Protestant and Catholic Christians bore heroic witness to their faith, but the total Christian witness was ambiguous. The Catholic Church, which resisted Nazism in the end, first made compromises with it because it saw it as a foe of communism. It resisted communism more unequivocally. But it was also involved in the decadent feudalism, of Eastern Europe for instance, the injustices of which furnished the resentments upon which communism fed. Protestant Christianity had its own heroes of resistance to both fascism and communism. But it contributed by its indifference to political and economic justice to the rise of both; and it was, and is, tainted by communist sympathies.

The self-destruction of these two demonic movements is therefore a manifestation of the sovereignty of God over history which is greater than anything suggested by the phrase "Christ and his Church." For the Church is deeply involved in the sins of the world; and never more so than when it pretends to divine sanctity, as in the case of Catholicism. One suspects, in fact, that the phrase "Christ and his Church" hides the

heresy which the Advisory Commission wanted to warn against, by distinguishing between the divine sovereignty and the history conceived in terms of human virtues and human powers. The point is that the divine sovereignty expresses itself not chiefly by the aid of human virtues and powers but despite human weaknesses; and it uses all kinds of instruments for its purpose, including the virtues of non-Christians and the self-defeat of the sins of men.

II

This does not mean that the conscious effort to do God's will is irrelevant or that the Church, as that community where the mystery of the divine sovereignty is disclosed, does not play a significant part in God's designs. Most of the illustrations which Latourette uses are in fact excellent examples of the working of Christ's spirit in the affairs of men. They only become absurd when it is implied that the triumph of Christ depends upon them. For not only are the historical fruits of Christian men and of the Church continually ambiguous, but the effects in history of those who do not consciously follow God's will are very important. The design which the Bible discerns in God's sovereignty over history is in every case more majestic than can be seen if we try to isolate Christian virtues and attribute certain types of moral progress to them.

Most of the examples which Professor Latourette gives of men and women who incarnated the spirit of Christ, and particularly his emphasis upon humble men and women whose lives cannot be obviously fitted into some grand pattern of history but who are nevertheless significant in the eyes of faith, call attention to the fact that the witness of faith, and of love as a fruit of faith, is more important than the witness of hope.

The situation seems to be that the Christian faith affirms that the drama of each individual life and of the whole human enterprise is played on a larger stage than the one-dimensional nature-history which the historians chart. It is declared to be under a higher sovereignty than the system of nature and of reason which scientists and philosophers discern. The only real but important proof of such an affirmation is that the human self transcends all the sovereignties which are known, and that life does not make any sense if it is measured in the dimension of the "wisdom of the world." We are either driven to despair by its meaninglessness or to various types of madness by trying to make sense out of it from our own standpoint. The madness is the consequence of our grasping for power or prestige or wisdom beyond the obvious limits of creatures. The alternative is to discern by faith the higher dimension and to be assured that

"neither life nor death nor any other creature is able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

A concomitant of the faith that Christ is a clue to the mystery of the divine sovereign of human life and history is that human life transcends our earthly existence. There is no witness for such a faith and such a hope except the nonchalance of perfect faith and love, which is able to say "whether we live we live unto the Lord, whether we die we die unto the Lord, whether we live therefore or die we are the Lord's." This nonchalance is a perfect witness to the faith only if it results in an actual mitigation of the lust for power and prestige by which the faithless people try to make sense out of life.

But such a faith leaves the question unanswered how the whole human enterprise will come to a conclusion. The New Testament eschatology assumes that human history will be fragmentary and contradictory to the end, that the worst form of evil, the "anti-Christ," will appear at the end of history; and that the final victory of Christ will therefore come not in history but at the end of history. This assumes that the moral ambiguities of history and its contradictions will not be mitigated. They may even be heightened. The New Testament eschatology assumes that they will be heightened. "In the last days" many evils will appear. Men will be "proud, boasters, lovers of themselves." This eschatology seemed highly speculative; and since the Renaissance it has also seemed irrelevant because another way was found to give history meaning. The meaning was furnished by the development of all good things in history. The Christian faith did not relinquish its faith in personal immortality, but it substituted the modern idea of progress for this eschatology of the New Testament.

The choice of the World Council theme is an effort to recall the Church to the hope as expressed in the New Testament. In a sense this is an appropriate era in which to make the attempt. For the substitute faith which seemed so plausible in the nineteenth century is rather fantastic now in an age of probable atomic wars and of global conflicts instead of the hoped-for global peace. Professor Latourette, as a good historian, allows the evidence for this nature of history to appear in his analysis, though he clings to the old faith by his insistence that "Christ and his Church" are becoming progressively more influential. We are living in an age in which the modern substitute for Christian eschatology, which was once so plausible, has become more fantastic than the Christian hope of the parousia of Christ.

III

I would maintain nevertheless that the selection of eschatology was faulty statesmanship, if it was the concern of the Church to bear witness to its faith before the world. The New Testament eschatology is at once too naïve for a sophisticated world and too sophisticated for the simple-minded modern man, who has become so accustomed to try to make sense out of life by measuring history in terms of some scheme of rational intelligibility. It is just as foolish to bear witness to our faith by insisting on what will seem to the world a fantastic hope as to bear witness to our faith by our personal hope of "the resurrection." These two hopes are indeed an integral part of the faith. But we might not in the hour of death be perfectly certain of our destiny after death and we might, despite these doubts, have given a genuine witness of our faith, if we had borne pain and sorrow with patience and had been released from self-concern so that our hearts went out to our brethren.

While the present seems a very strategic era in which to restore a part of the New Testament faith which had become discredited and obscured, we need only to analyze the needs of our generation to recognize that it is not particularly redemptive to approach a disillusioned generation with a proud "I told you so" and a fanciful picture of the end of history, or at least a picture which will seem fanciful to our generation, whether Christian or secular. What would be more to the point is to bear witness to our faith in terms of attitudes of watchfulness and soberness rather than the alternate moods of "sleep and drunkenness" which St. Paul describes as the moods of "the night," that is, as the consequences of the lack of faith in the Lord of history who has been revealed to us in Christ.

Our generation has these moods of sleep and drunkenness, of complacency and hysteria, not only alternately but simultaneously; for we are curiously hysterical about communism but complacent about the possibilities of an atomic war. The poor Civil Defense Administrator has difficulty in getting anyone to man the civil defense, and he rightly surmises that the dangers of atomic destruction are so monstrous that the imagination either refuses to comprehend them or is incapable of doing so. Yet these dangers are no more than the most vivid expressions of the peril of death which we have always faced, and which our generation by some legerdemain has sought to banish from the imagination.

To "watch and be sober" means that, armed by our faith, we will not be surprised by any evil which appears in history; and in our surprise we will not seek escape into either complacency or hysteria. Such a genuine

Christian nonchalance might actually help our civilization to survive; since its dangers are actually increased by complacency on the one hand and by hysteria on the other.

But the final paradox of faith is that the Christian faith and hope will be most creative if we are not too preoccupied with its current relevance and pragmatic efficiency. In that sense the contemporary preoccupation of our culture with history has made it less effective in historical action than it ought to be. This is an ironic refutation of the secular humanism which believed that if only it disavowed the transhistorical interests of the Christian faith and centered the attention of man upon historical goals, it could establish a heaven upon earth. This heaven on earth turned out in the case of orthodox Marxism to be a communist hell. In the case of liberal utopianism it has degenerated into the far less dangerous but equally pathetic hopes for a "scientific" management of human affairs, which would in time eliminate human "aggressiveness" and establish some kind of human consensus through the "common faith" of all right-minded and "enlightened" people.

These modern faiths were fantastic enough and they have suffered tragic refutation. But they must be answered by a faith which does not place its main emphasis upon a hope which will seem equally fantastic, but upon a life of soberness and watchfulness, of faith and of love—which will appeal to a world in the night of despair as having some gleams of light in it, derived from the "Light that shineth in darkness."

From F. Ernest Stoeffler

I

IN ONE OF HIS BOOKS ARNOLD TOYNBEE makes the observation that it is the scholar's task to add a bucketful of water to the growing river of knowledge. For many months the theme before us has been discussed in scholarly dissertations. Within the limited space of this article it will perhaps be enough to add merely a drop to the scholar's bucket.

"Christ the Hope of the World." This is a positive affirmation of our Faith which, on the one hand, moves us to profound gratitude. The knowledge that there is One upon whom we may steadfastly fix our hope, as we review certain disturbing aspects of our civilization, is a source of comfort and joy. Yet the theme of the Evanston Assembly presents a challenge as well; and it is the challenge upon which many of us care to focus our attention. Jesus Christ is indeed the hope of all who acknowledge him as Savior and Lord, but he cannot in actuality be the hope of the *world* unless we permit him to work toward that end through us. God has chosen human agents to make his will effective in history. Each generation, therefore, as it meets Christ, the world's hope, must ask anew the question: How shall we interpret that hope so as to make it effective now?

To find an answer to that question is not easy. It must ultimately grow out of our philosophy of history. That being the case, the attempt will be made here to set forth some factors which are important to a Christian interpretation of history which meets the needs of our time.

As the Christian of today looks at history he finds himself inevitably beset by a serious travail of soul. This grows out of certain antinomies which invariably relate themselves to its interpretation. There is the antinomy of good and evil, for instance. Through the centuries and in every age men have found enough good in historic events to commit them to the faith that the whole process is ordered by the providence of a beneficent Deity. That view is embodied in both the Old and New Testaments. In the year A.D. 221 it prompted Julius Africanus to set forth his famous universal chronography. About a hundred years later it moved

F. ERNEST STOEFLER, S.T.M., S.T.D., is Professor of Church History in the School of Theology of Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. His approach to the question is, "How can we make that hope effective now?"

Eusebius of Cesarea to write his ecclesiastical history. In St. Augustine's *City of God* this view was elevated to a height from which it has influenced the Christian conception of the meaning of history ever since. All of these men and their great host of successors have found enough goodness expressed in human events to warrant their belief in the ultimate sovereignty of a good God.

Yet there is evil in the world also, and the intensity with which it strikes our imagination depends, perhaps, largely on our point of view. It is this destructive element, apparent in all historical configurations of meaning, which impelled Oswald Spengler to predict the inevitable doom of our Western civilization. This same evil moved Nicolas Berdyaev (*The Meaning of History*, 1936) to see history dominantly in terms of conflict and tragedy. It is the same consideration of the terrifying reality of social evil which evoked Arnold Toynbee's trumpet calls to a reconsideration of our ways.

Nor can we justify any endeavor to exempt the Church from the influences of evil. After we have constructed our high and lofty doctrines of the nature of the Church and after we have extolled her excellencies through our esthetic endeavors, she is still in large measure a human institution. Hence, whatever decisions were made in her historic councils were subject to the influence of evil. By the same token whatever happens in the ecclesiastical conferences, board meetings, and lecture halls today is always in danger of being conditioned by factors other than wholly good.

Not only are we aware of this problem of good and evil as it affects history, but also of the antinomy of freedom and necessity. Actually man's position in the temporal process is quite ambiguous. He is not only its creator but also its creature; he finds himself at the same time over against it and implicated in it; he has the freedom to modify it, but is also under the inexorable necessity of being modified by it. While we know ourselves free to choose with reference to any historic situation, we know, too, that the various decisions of our ancestors helped to fix the lines which our choices can never transcend.

A case in point is the present struggle between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, which seems to extend itself in ever-widening circles around the globe. In the Roman drive of our day for ascendancy we feel again the power of St. Augustine's great mind and the lofty vision which lured him on to build the *City of God*. American Protestantism's

increasingly vocal resistance is equally conditioned by the past. In part, at least, its decisions are inspired by the insights gained during the stormy days of the Reformation. The thoughts of Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Knox, as well as of the lesser-known Anabaptists, still help to determine our attitudes and our actions.

Thus our historic decisions are born of both necessity and freedom. This in spite of the fact that necessity alone is at present such an intriguing and seemingly "scientific" key to the meaning of history that many of our modern historians and sociologists have fallen victim to it. The older students of history, on the other hand, were inclined to put the emphasis upon man's freedom. To them the course of human events was mainly determined by the biography of great men, superior individuals who were believed to be capable of rising above their environment and of entering creatively into the problem of shaping their destiny.

A third antinomy influencing the interpretation of history involves the fact that we are a part of nature while at the same time we transcend it. In our day it is hardly necessary to point out how seriously and steadily man can fix his gaze upon himself and see merely a clever animal. For some time, now, that has been the prevailing mood in the science departments of many a university and college. Some of the shocking cruelties of our age, committed in the name of sovereign states, are really nothing else but a logical and consistent application of this doctrine to practical problems.

Still man can never resign himself completely to the belief that he is merely an animal. The very thought, once it strikes him with full impact, is revolting. Perhaps that is precisely the reason why our totalitarian systems inevitably tend to become more than mere attempts at human government. By some inner necessity they eventuate in religious configurations of meaning in which man asserts his higher nature by worshiping his corporate self.

Nor is this temptation entirely confined to totalitarian systems. As one follows the pronouncements of certain superpatriotic organizations and agencies in our own country, he cannot help but be very decidedly alarmed by the general tendency which seems implicit in these pronouncements. It is exactly the same tendency to absolutize one particular folk and its ways which has destroyed other nations by distorting their vision. From the theological point of view all such attempts are really nothing else but an unconscious admission that man cannot live without an Absolute which

will give meaning to his efforts and values. If he has no God he finds himself inevitably driven to elevate himself to that position.

II

We have called attention to these antinomies because they have bearing on the points of view from which Christians today interpret the historical process. These are in their extremes two—the liberal-humanistic and the neo-orthodox. Constituting as they do the thesis and antithesis of our twentieth-century interpretation of history, neither of them is satisfactory.

The humanist position, which is set forth admirably by Shirley Jackson Case in his *Christian Philosophy of History* (1943), needs little exposition. Many of us were intellectually weaned on it and all of us have lived with it for a long time. Dr. Case points to its central conviction when he says, "History has been and is still made by living men, and its quality is conditioned by the persistence of their struggle to overcome evil with good. The key to success is human activism inspired by the desire to make the world a better place in which to live. In the language of religion, this means the attempt of each successive generation to bring a little nearer to realization the kingdom of God on earth." In fine, the meaning of history is found in a socially perfect society progressively constructed by man under the inspiration of an immanent Deity.

Every fair-minded critic must readily concede that this point of view has done much for the American Church. Its pragmatic approach to the Christian Faith found its cutting edge in the so-called "Social Gospel" movement. Under the inspiration of the great apostles of this movement—Henry Churchill King, Gerald Birney Smith and Walter Rauschenbusch—the Church was inspired with a social vision unprecedented in its long history. Though this movement as such finally evaporated in a beautiful dream between two world wars, American Christianity is the better for having seen such a vision.

To us who now regard it as merely a historic phase of Christian thought, its shortcomings are obvious and glaring. In the light of recent events its naïve assumptions about the intrinsic goodness of man seem almost adolescent. There is little appreciation of the fact that man's greatest foe in the twentieth century is man himself. His greatest fear, which expresses itself in his social, political, and economic relations, in his art, his literature, his preachers and social philosophies, is his fear of

himself. Man knows he can progressively master his environment, but he is not at all sure at present of whether or not he will be able to master his own passions. Some Christians may still see man wrapped in a halo of divine potentialities, but the people whose countries have been ravaged by war, the people who are exploited by greed or depressed by prejudice, see him in a different light. And, alas, there are many such people in our world today. The radical evil in man, which expresses itself in his corporate life, cannot be as lightly treated as the Christian humanists tried to do.

Nor dare we overestimate man's freedom to shape his destiny. He is indeed able to choose between alternatives, but the alternatives open to choice are determined by the historical situation. It is true, for instance, that most of us do not want either war or a heavily armed peace. Yet we must choose between the two. To a large number of Americans a third choice seems unthinkable under present circumstances. Thus to assume that through unselfish choices man is free to progress inevitably toward a better society impresses many of us as a bit of wishful thinking which is incongruous with the reality in the midst of which we must live out our lives.

Perhaps one of the greatest weaknesses of Christian humanism as related to the interpretation of history is to be found in the fact that it seeks the end in the process. On the theological level this conviction is generally expressed by the conception of the Kingdom of God as a kind of glorified democracy which we are in process of establishing. As has been repeatedly pointed out during the last decade this conception was certainly foreign to the thinking of our Lord and his early interpreters. Whatever may be the truth about the eschatological aspects of his teaching, it appears certain that he did not think of the Kingdom as being exclusively of this world. He thought of it primarily as a spiritual reality, supra-historical in essence, though continually modifying the course of history in a Godward direction.

Aside from the fact that this interpretation of the Kingdom is unbiblical, it is religiously disastrous. By absolutizing some imagined system of social relationships the Christian humanist makes himself actually guilty of setting up an idol. He tends to disregard the fact that in his finitude he cannot know what such a system ought to be. Nor does he realize that some of the greatest evils in history have been brought about by precisely such an attempt to absolutize some creation of man's ingenuity, be that a doctrine, an institution, a social or economic system.

By raising some creature of his imagination to a position of absolute validity and authority, man actually crowds God out of his world. Or, at any rate, God's will, his providence, and his judgment become decidedly secondary in importance. God may vaguely inspire men, but he is not sovereign; he may be the source of goodness, but he is not Alpha and Omega. The result is a Christianity which is of the earth, earthy. As art which is detached from all religious feeling no longer elicits man's deepest emotions, so a Christianity which is detached from the living God, personal and sovereign, no longer calls forth the profoundest loyalties.

III

Over against Christian humanism and in radical opposition to it stands the newer mood in theology. Through Kierkegaard's moments of deep despair, first made known to Western Christendom by disillusioned German scholars, it projected itself upon the modern scene. Nourished by wars and rumors of wars, it began to dominate the imagination of great minds. As a result there came into being the dialectical school of Christian interpretation. Needless to say, these newer theologies are highly divergent at many points. Basically they agree, however, in their emphasis upon the transcendence of God. Following Karl Barth they declare that God is *totaliter aliter*, the Wholly Other. They agree also in their decidedly negative estimate of man's ability to help himself morally and spiritually. Significantly the famous controversy between Barth and Brunner during the early thirties did not raise the question of what man can do for his salvation. It was carried on at the point of *Wortempfänglichkeit*, the issue between them being whether or not man can even *hear* the Word in the orders of creation without the previous impartation of divine grace. Thus the emphasis is upon man's depravity and finitude.

The influence of this kind of thinking has made itself felt in connection with the Christian interpretation of history. A case in point is Otto Piper's *God in History* (1939). According to Dr. Piper secular history is quite completely under the domination of the Evil One, God being concerned only about sacred history. Under those circumstances man is obviously powerless to do very much about the shaping of his historic destiny. The outlook of Nicolas Berdyaev, whose voice was heard from the East in his *Meaning of History* (1936), was similarly pessimistic. Much is said here about the tragedy of "terrestrial" history which is finally relieved by the triumph of "celestial" history. Others whose spirits were

equally weighed down by a consideration of the evils of society have followed in their footsteps.

In its reaction against a superficial humanism this approach moved too far in the opposite direction. Its pessimism as implied in its doctrine of man would eventually stifle all striving within the Church for social betterment. Its doctrine of radical transcendence removes God too far from the scene of human action. It gives man the feeling of being alone as he faces the challenge of life's problems. The insistence upon history as being merely a temporal interlude punctuated with struggle, tragedy, and despair and ultimately issuing in failure focuses attention too strongly upon the power of evil. Such a position will inevitably lead to unmitigated defeatism in the social arena. We may say, then, that this type of theology provides a good and necessary corrective. Yet, as an interpretation of history it must have disastrous results. It is a point of view born of despair, nurtured by disappointment, and possibly in essence an unconscious attempt to excuse the social failures of our civilization.

IV

Over against these more or less extreme positions a truly realistic philosophy of history which soberly but confidently looks to Christ as our Hope appears to be the pressing need of our day. We are living in an age which is chastened by disillusionment and characterized by a sense of frustration with regard to the attainment of many of our social ideals. In such an intellectual atmosphere an easy optimism must fall increasingly flat upon the ears of our present generation. At the same time we as Americans dare not permit ourselves to be overwhelmed by the cries of futility and despair which originate from other quarters of the globe. At this point in history it may well be our mission to counteract the imminent danger of a world neurosis. If so, we should accept that mission both humbly and courageously.

If under divine guidance we are to achieve a Christian philosophy of history which will satisfy our present needs, a number of things must be kept in mind. Perhaps we may point out at least some of these.

In reviewing the works of Arnold Toynbee and Herbert Butterfield one is impressed by the somber tones in which these men write. All the lovely pipe dreams and sentimental little nothings of former days are resolutely excluded. They take seriously the antinomies in which human existence is enmeshed and the inevitable enigmas with which we find our-

selves continually confronted. They see not only good, but evil, and evil as a terrible reality; not only freedom, but inexorable necessity. They regard men as potential sons of God but also as participating in the limitations of the natural order. To them God's judgments, as well as his mercy, are visible in history. It would seem that any interpretation of history which is to be meaningful to our generation must exhibit that kind of a sober mood.

It is hardly necessary, however, to discard entirely the traditional Christian belief in progress as both Toynbee and Butterfield seem to have done. The horizon of the former is darkened by a rather rigid determinism which operates in the rise and fall of civilizations. To Butterfield all the meaning there is in history is that which is found in the relationship between a given historical situation and the personalities which are involved in that particular situation. He feels that history's goal is that of building character and, therefore, he recognizes no transcendent purpose which teleologically ties epoch to epoch and age to age. For some of us it is difficult to see, however, how a Christian interpretation of history can dispense with the belief that there is a goal toward which the whole process moves.

It is true that the exact nature of such a goal has not been disclosed to us in the past. Nor can we as finite and sinful beings apprehend it in its fullness now. Only its dim outline is revealed to us from age to age as we endeavor to identify ourselves with it. Yet, without this basic belief both the prophetic and eschatological elements of the Bible are devoid of dynamic. Lacking such a "great divine event" history is nothing but the concretion of a series of divine whimsies, and our life becomes a little ephemerality in a sea of ultimate meaninglessness.

Most of us would accept the proposition that history moves from crisis to crisis, every new solution of a problem tending to become the occasion for other problems on a subsequent level of culture. We admit that because of the evil in man, human collectives always have been and perhaps always will be given to self-interest; that for the same reason, there will always be social tensions and conflicts. We refrain from building utopias and resign ourselves to the fact that social justice must always be relative justice as applied by men whose vision, understanding, insight, and benevolence are necessarily imprisoned within the sphere of their human limitations. At the same time, however, we cannot help but feel that our Western civilization has moved forward in its general approximation of the ideals of the Christian ethic, the validity of which we accept on faith.

In that sense we have made progress. While both at home and abroad we see disturbing phenomena on the social horizon, we cannot permit these to obstruct our vision of the moral gains which have been made.

Many of us would not care to be quite as optimistic about the social achievements of Christianity as is Dr. Latourette in his contribution to this symposium. Yet, we can see gains. As Protestants, for instance, it would be difficult for us to deny that the Reformation with its emphasis upon freedom of conscience and individual responsibility was a step in the right direction. Our present conception of the dignity of man, our enlarging ideal of social justice, the almost universal recognition of war as an evil, our growth away from the pettiness of tribalism involve moral and spiritual progress which cannot easily be discounted. For American preachers and theologians to lose sight of these gains would be tragic.

From a realistic point of view we can no longer talk glibly about "bringing in the Kingdom" as if the Kingdom of God were an ideal system of social relationships which we are in process of establishing. As we take seriously the power of evil we despair of any such establishment by human agency alone. Going back to the eschatology of the early Church, the faith grows within us that the final aspect of the coming of the Kingdom will result from the radical intervention of God in human affairs and is, therefore, beyond history. While as Christians we thus recognize the fact that the ultimate goal of history lies beyond the horizon of time, it is the temporal process, however, toward which our creative energies must be directed. Our reason for saying so grows out of the very nature of our faith. The Kingdom of God is also a present reality within us, a reality which must express itself continually and dynamically in our individual and social concerns. Men and women around us need the Gospel. There are loads to be lifted, attitudes to be changed, prejudices to be overcome, wounds to be healed, relationships to be brought under the judgment of God. In the face of these needs and as a result of our faith we dare not use the biblical eschatology as an excuse for social inactivity.

Yet, the warning of Emil Brunner (*Christianity and Civilization*, 1948, 1949) must not go unheeded. The chief end of our Christian effort dare not be social reform. It is the primary duty and privilege of the responsible Christian to help men toward salvation from their guilt and the power of sin, to help them walk in newness of life and in close communion with God, to help them know through personal experience Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord. The effort to point toward a nobler social

vision is indeed essential, but it is always and necessarily secondary. Any endeavor in theology to make the search for social integration primary is as futile and disastrous as the attempt to make the search for immediate happiness primary in a system of ethics.

Furthermore, it is important for us to remember that we can never permanently and completely identify the Christian Faith with the ideology of any political, economic, social, or even national group. The reason for this is obvious. There are few if any social issues in connection with which right is all on the one side and wrong on the other. Sharing in the general ambiguity of human existence, social controversies are usually such as to range evil and good on both sides. It is our obligation, therefore, always to preserve the liberty of the Christian man who as sympathetic critic can see both sides of the question, though in the end he is forced to choose the one which appears to him to be nearest to the ideal.

If as American Christians we could understand this a little more clearly, if we could bring ourselves to a point where our Christian Faith might be a little less definitely identified with the so-called "American Way of Life," it would be so much easier for Christians of other lands both to understand and to love us.

From a realistic point of view it should also be said that our *modus operandi* ought not to be dominantly that of exerting political pressure. While such pressure cannot be entirely dissociated from other ways of procedure it is, nevertheless, a modern sword by which they that use it too confidently may perish. Certainly their prestige and prophetic authority must finally perish, for in the popular mind they will be associated with the lobbyists and five-percenters who clamor for special interests. It would seem that the influence of the Church must make itself primarily felt through other means—namely, criticism, enlightenment, and inspiration. It is through these that we must try to help shape the course of history. As we do so we keep ourselves free from political and ideological entanglements which eventually may become embarrassing.

In conclusion it must be stated that man's relation to the historical process cannot be fully understood unless it be seen in the light of the cross of Christ. That is one of the basic insights of Reinhold Niebuhr as well as of Paul Tillich. In the cross we have the supreme expression of God's sacrificial love. Our faith in God becomes truly redemptive in so far as it expresses itself in terms of that love. It is this principle of sacrificial love which carries within it the germs of a civilization's ultimate survival, for

it is such love alone that can overcome the destructive tensions which inevitably and continually arise within groups.

As Toynbee points out, however, it is never the broad majority upon which a society can build its hope. That hope must be founded upon a creative minority which meets a succession of stimulating challenges with a succession of victorious responses. Thus the task of the Church becomes apparent. It is she who above all other institutions must furnish the morally and spiritually creative core of our society. Taking her stand upon the Gospel of sacrificial love she must evaluate critically the motives, goals, and actions of men. Humbly and sincerely she must endeavor to enlighten them about their corporate destiny, a destiny which is revealed only in process of achievement. Courageously she must inspire men to move toward the realization of the noblest dreams of which under the guidance of the Spirit of God a given society at a given point in history has become aware.

Denominations or Union?

JOHN M. VERSTEEG

I

PHILOSOPHY, said Borden Parker Bowne, is chiefly a disease of words. One is, at times, tempted to say that of religion. Words that should be read and known of all run a fever or a temper, or run out. They become emotion-laden. Regard such words as "ecumenicity," "unity," "church union."

Ecumenicity is an old word with a new meaning. Archbishop Temple called it "the great new fact of our time." Yet its use has become a fashionable fad, uttered with some such gusto as Whitefield's alleged pronunciation of "that blessed word Mesopotamia." It is an ace up the raveled sleeve of many a Protestant preaching. At the sound of it, good people smite their breasts, and return. They have had their emotional release, and hop back to competitive normalcy. The word is full of sound and sentiment, and may signify nothing but that the preacher has nothing to signify. It is a sweet morsel in the mouths of preparers of church-school literature. It is running all over the lots in current poetry, and gives stodgy editorials a delectable flavor. Of the making of books on it there seems to be no end; the search for the substance of the shadow can take one on quite a trip. Down Princeton way, one ingenious lad is cooking up an ecumenical hymnal, and the boys in seminary, in a dry and thirsty land where not too much water is, lap up ecumenicity, and have their times of refreshing from it. Every effort is made to condition our fledgling ministers to it. For here is a nice new way of saying, "The more we get together, the happier we'll be." O, ecumenicity, what crimes are committed in thy name!

But when William Temple popularized this word, he was mouthing no innocuous pretension. Great words like "catholic" and "cosmopolitan" broke down under the load he wanted carried. He sought to stress the universal agreements that travel without passport and invade every realm.

JOHN M. VERSTEEG, Litt.D., D.D., is pastor of the First Methodist Church, Athens, Ohio, and Director of Wesley Foundation at Ohio University. He seeks a principle for union that will not entail the dubious attempt to abolish differences.

He stood in need of a word that would integrate that total experience of God's grace which men mean when they speak of the church. He was after a word that would express the solidarity, not only of a world-wide, but of the life-wide fellowship. And "ecumenicity" was that word. He felt it could fit all the folds of all these facts better than any other. This is the word that should now run free course, and be glorified and dignified with reverence and precision. Hence many of us want the integrity of that word to be safeguarded.

Ecumenicity, on any minimal basis, is two-sided: a growing conviction and an earnest effort. It is the conviction that the experience of the God of Christ unifies people into comradeship and co-operation; that the conscience of the church must be sensitized toward recognizing and realizing this experience and unity; that the visible church must organize itself on this larger and higher basis; that all churches should identify themselves with the entire Christian fellowship; that solidarity in life and witness and labor is the concern of the church and must be effectively demonstrated throughout the world; that the church is responsible for the character of civilization and must bring spiritual order into our common life. Ecumenicity is also the effort on the part of the churches and their members to implement these convictions. Denominations and their agencies, city, county, and state councils of churches, National and World Councils, in varying ways and degrees, seek to bring churches and their members to an appreciation of their oneness in Christ; to stress solidarity rather than separateness; to eliminate the competitions, disunities and superiority complexes of churches and their members; to maintain freedom and yet to attain fellowship in worship and service; to initiate, consolidate and promote concrete opportunities for the attainment of these objectives. This sketchy survey ought to convince all "ecumaniacs" that ecumenicity is an outward and visible sign of the inward and illuminating experience of at-one-ment in Christ, and should help them to see that ecumenicity sees the church in truer perspective, and lives and moves and has its being in a profounder fellowship than most of us dream of.

One would suppose that a word with so dynamic a coverage would be acclaimed by all. But only in May, 1953, the press reported one church leader as saying to his Convention: "When our . . . doctrines are properly understood . . . communism will be abolished, dictators dethroned, *ecumenicalism* destroyed and liberalism defeated." Many a similar incantation has been invoked by people of whom John Wesley said in 1748: "The thing I was greatly afraid of all the time . . . was a nar-

rowness of spirit . . . that miserable bigotry which makes many so unready to believe that there is any work of God but among themselves."

Look now at the word *unity*. For most of us the word means oneness of spirit: agreement, accord, concord, harmony. "Behold, how good and pleasant it is for brethren to dwell in unity." If ecumenicity stands for the intimate integration of his people by God, unity tends to stress the more human concurrence of the spiritual forces on the basis of freedom. The Protestant Episcopal Church has a Commission on the Approaches to Unity; and such organizations as the World and National Councils of Churches alike illustrate and demonstrate the existence and the potential of unity.

It seems beyond credence that unity should be decried. But it is! If the newspaper accounts of the latest meet of the largest denomination to stay out of the National Council may be trusted, this is what its presiding officer said: "We are like a healthy, wealthy, attractive young lady, and these Lotharios are making eyes at us. . . . One suitor . . . has announced that a chair is being reserved for us . . . thinking of that chair as a love seat. But this young lady realizes that for her it would become a 'hot seat' . . . an electric chair. . . . The moment she sits down in that chair she signs her own death warrant and sets the date of her execution." If this seems to you to major in the moronic, remember that the dominant occupant of the jungle of conceit is the lone wolf. Denominational pride, doctrinal divergences, blindness to the values that lie in diversity can nullify co-operation and stultify evaluation.

Regard the third term. There have been many attempts at *church union* and much has been achieved. As early as 1274, at the Council of Lyons, and in 1438, at the Council of Ferrara, leaders sought to get East and West to walk together and be agreed. No major Reformer wanted division. Crossing an ocean was a risky thing in Calvin's day, yet he said he would gladly cross ten of them to bring the church together. Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Melanchthon—one could call the whole roll of them—aimed to save, and not to sever, the Church. At Ratibon, in 1541, and in other places and ways, outstanding Romanists and Protestants sought to solve their differences. Since then, many noble souls have shown similar concern. These earlier efforts aimed to bring back an organization of identical doctrines and procedures.

But now that ecumenicity is the soul of which church union is the body, a different factor has entered in. The Methodist Church ordered its Commission on Church Union to "consider specific overtures and pro-

posals with other denominations; to initiate studies looking toward organic union, to confer with representatives of other denominations in any general discussion of church union, to encourage interdenominational co-operation throughout the church and to have responsibility for any interdenominational activities not specifically cared for by other agencies." The order says nothing about defending doctrines or preserving procedures, precious as these are. Something of this willingness to let the Spirit lead the Church has been evident in most of the unions that have occurred in the last half-century, though obviously, groups with similar doctrines and types of administration found it easiest to unite.

The divine imperative is that

. . . we all attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God . . . we are to grow up in every way into him who is the Head, into Christ, from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by every joint with which it is supplied, when each part is working properly, makes bodily growth and upbuilds itself in love.¹

Hence not uniformity but fellowship, and the realization that God is in this fellowship, is seen to be central. If the Greenwich Conference on Church Union gave wide publicity to its confidence in what, for want of a better word, might be called the God-led-ness of the churches other than one's own, it achieved a significant Kingdom emphasis.

Our Lord forms his followers into the most inspired and inspiring force in the world. The church is already the most united group we know. As Visser 't Hooft once put it:

If it is recognized that Christ is at work in other churches . . . it is the duty of each church in the fellowship to listen to the witness of other churches; to open itself to the truth of God which it may learn from them, and to be ready to let its own faith and life be enriched or corrected by this fraternal contact.²

Where is there currently a more uniting force than the church? That this uniting may be continued and accelerated, leaders in ecumenicity realize that almost the first step to be taken is a far wider knowledge concerning the entire ecumenical movement. The crowds that respond to the challenges of E. Stanley Jones do so because he is openly tackling its problems. All other potentials and proposals of church union ought to get wider attention. This means a more profoundly informed ministry. And it means a more considered approach on the part of the governing bodies of the denominations.

¹ Eph. 4:13, 15f., R.S.V.

² As reported in *The Christian Century*.

II

We have been thinking of three terms, each suggesting the limitless, each often limited by those who use them. Some who applaud ecumenicity do little about unity. Some want unity, but not church union. Why all this settling down in halfway houses? There is no one answer. But one of them is suggested by looking at a few of the meanings of the word *church*. The church may mean the fellowship God creates through those who experience his grace (Protestants experience his grace in freedom). The church may also mean a denomination. It may mean an organization for the maintenance and promotion of religion, with staffs, credits, contracts, properties, budgets all in the picture. And sometimes we use the word *church* merely for a building. But the word "church" may, and should mean the ecumenical church manifested in time and place in a local church. It is not easy to get a coherent view of the church. Many of us, at this point, are not in proximity to a good perspective.

This is especially true when it comes to the *denomination*. How often and how regularly is that denounced as the major deterrent of the oneness and unity of the church! Anyone who senses the competition that in hamlet, town and country so steadily beset us, breaking the hearts of all men in the ministry, save those skilled in publicity or favored by circumstance, will know why this objection to denominations goes so deep with many. Anyone who sees overchurched communities wasting their spiritual substance in riotous dislikes and in noncooperation will be tempted to take a dim view of denominationalism. No wonder there is so much rooting for grass-roots church union, even though the record of grass-roots union is singularly unimpressive. It is on the local levels that the evils of denominationalism are most apparent.

One small city has three Methodist churches, diverging on cultural and economic grounds. In this town, a church of another denomination sought new members in the name of ecumenicity. Thus ecumenicity itself served as a cover to make sheepstealing look legitimate and not the dirty thing it is. Then there is the church where a minister of pronounced liberal views had rough going of it, and was followed by one who claims to major in biblical preaching, and has reintroduced creeds into his services for public worship. A local lad started a new church in the name of a denomination that had no church there, adding to a competition already marked among fundamentalist groups. An immersionist church, part of a significant denomination, for all its load of water, carries itself correctly

down the middle of the road. Still another church gently but emphatically holds that the second blessing is required spiritual equipment. Enthusiastically detached from all the rest is a church that, on so-called scriptural grounds, rejects the use of an organ; and another has the seventh and not the first day as its time of spiritual celebration. One church had bestowed upon it, by its denomination, a plant of outstanding attractiveness, thus giving it a decided edge competitively. While it is true that several of the denominations of which these churches are part are more congenial to ecumenicity than they are, this city of not quite twelve thousand illustrates how little even of aloof association it has to go on, and that ecumenicity is a sapling when it has to grow in the woods of rivalry.

The cry of the man in the street who is never run over by ideas, "Why don't they all get together?" echoes the mind of the mentally blind. The emotional charm of ecumenicity goes down before its sturdy facts like a bowing fence and a tottering wall. I have taken away the breath of many an Episcopalian layman by telling him that Methodists were exploring the possibilities of church union with the representatives of his group. How can his church fall so low as to associate with such lesser breeds without the Lambeth Conference? And Methodist laymen have been equally terrified at the suggestion that they may yet have to sit in the same pew with the social snobs and liquor topers they associate with the Episcopal Church!

III

Well, there *is* another side to the ledger of denominationalism. We have had some four centuries of it. In that time denominations have made major contributions to the Christian cause, and, not infrequently, to each other. Chad Walsh says that "each denomination is a kind of spiritual specialization." One has specialized in worship, another in social action, still another in religious freedom. Not all done by denominations was to the good or simon-pure. But most of them explored and discovered truth, found enlarging ways of Christian living, assumed some responsibility for the condition and character of civilization; perfected organizations and programs, made the Scriptures and hymnody forces for faith, practiced means of grace, gave impetus to education and social work; placed Christian value on vocation: all because they had what Hocking called "the grit of the particular."

If the church ecumenically had even a part of this "grit" which so many denominations so splendidly possess, we should not have to counter the justly impatient with the counsel to be patient. How fine it would be

if we could spell out definite procedures, as denominations so regularly do, instead of reminding the spiritually minded that we may have to wait for the discovery of an ecclesiastical energy that will be the equivalent of the discovery of atomic energy, save that it will be completely constructive rather than potentially destructive!

That denominations have suffered from self-centeredness and self-sufficiency goes without saying, and many of them fell victim to the secularizing cultures in which they lived. Economic, linguistic and theological factors had a large part in the making of denominations. Hence many sincerely hold that the best contribution they can make to the ecumenical church is to treasure the denominational heritage and to perfect its skills until the blessed day when union will be effected. If Methodists stressed experimental religion, Baptists wrought gloriously in liberty, Lutherans in churchmanship, Episcopalian in liturgy. . . . Such emphases still have significance, even in a day when major convictions and movements cross denominational lines.

It isn't just that people feel more at home in one group than another. What is a treasured theological tenacity for one, for another is a straight-jacket. For one a supervisory system seems sensible and desirable; for another, it spells slavery and the denial of democracy. Denominations have distinctive ways of life—and foibles! Methodists deny smoking to the clergy. Can you imagine a Congregationalist consenting to such a stricture, or Presbyterians pleasantly taking to any sort of moral dictatorship? It is obvious that when the Protestant Episcopal Church no longer produces Emily Posts, it will have lost its ancient power. Yet that church consistently closes its highest legislative branch to women. Whenever a Methodist morosely meditates on the shortcomings of his church, he picks up courage, if not a happy smile, the moment he learns the bondage in which the Episcopalian keep the society sisters!

Nothing is to be gained by minimizing the differences that characterize denominations. Divergencies of feeling, faith, and fashion exist. With this in mind it is easy to understand why there are those who feel that the best we can hope for in Protestantism is a strong but co-operative denominationalism! This is a particularly comfortable position for a pastor to take, since he steadily represents both unity and separateness. His success is usually measured by his ability to build up his own church numerically. Yet the gospel he preaches is universal. Hence ecumenicity is likely to tug at his conscience, and to circumscribe his passion for going it alone.

IV

Denominationalism is taken account of in the proposal for *Federal Union*, which deserves a more respectful review among our higher ecclesiastical brackets than it usually gets. Its major proponent is E. Stanley Jones, one of the most distinguished servants of the Kingdom of God in our generation. As an observer for the Methodist Commission on Church Union, the writer attended the Conference set up by Dr. Jones' group at Buck Hill Falls.

In *Federal Union*, the denominations remain, but "surrender sovereignty." Did not the States do likewise? But this reasoning may well be an oversimplification. Who is to decide what "sovereignty" is and how much of it is to be surrendered, even on the supposition that one can talk thus quantitatively? What if men are convinced that their "sovereignty" is of God; is it then theirs to give up? And will not a surrendered sovereignty, for all intents and purposes, be a control for the group to which it is surrendered, one which could conceivably turn the pope green with envy? And by what right is a surrendered sovereignty a legitimate basis for union?

When you speak of the church in this federal way, what are you talking about: *Essence or function?* If the latter, no new organization is needed, even though the United Church might prove a more exciting name. We already have what we need. The National Council exists. Not that, if tautology be permitted, it either does or wants to function for all function now. It is at present intentionally restricted to insure larger denominational participation in its fellowship and activities. But that it could be adjusted and perfected into an agency for functional unity *all along the line* is obvious to anyone who will take the time to study the place and power the denominations have, and could have, in its affairs. As things stand, this would probably happen only over the dead bodies of the commanding officers of the National Council; but even if commanding officers are not distinguished for their resurrections, there can be reincarnations and, if need be, replacements. No other organization is actually necessary. In baseball parlance, the National Council is on deck.

But if function is all one means with the church, how very little one means! To most of us, it is the essence of the church that matters. No church is worth uniting except on this thoroughgoing basis. Anything other would bring utility, not unity. And the utility is already, and increasingly, ours! The church is the God-created, God-sustained, God-centered Body whose head is Christ and whose members are the redeemed. The church

is at once visible and invisible; an institution whose fellowship is the movement and the motive of the Incarnation; a corporate entity which is wholeness and newness: God-high, life-wide, soul-deep. Though what is meant with God and Christ and salvation may depend on spiritual capacity and development, the experience of these must be identifiable as Christian by the generality of believers. For it is the essence of the church that it must create and recreate its function.

A federal functional union could conceivably shortchange spirituality. There is some suggestion of that in the way the chief protagonist of federal union sees the word "merger." But who of us puts his trust in mergers? It is the church that must be united or reunited, rather than churches that must be merged. The church is the eternal fellowship God made possible in Christ. It is far better to talk of the reunion of the church, or of the union of it, than of merger or union by merger. The church, as well as believers, is justified by faith—not by works! If mergers occur, they are a result, not a cause. The cause is at-one-ment in Christ. What is envisaged by church union is not reorganization but revival: reconstructing the visible church by the realization of the oneness Christ is, in his grace and love.

If it be argued that this process is slow, that the hurdles are many and the high spots few, that "one step enough for me" is the order of its growing, let it be remembered that speed is of dubious value; that life and light and love and loyalty mean far more. A union of churches, of and by itself, can never be church union.

If a personal testimony and observation may be permitted, let me say that it takes stamina to serve on a Commission on Church Union and stay hopeful! With the best of will, there's "many a conflict, many a doubt." For there must be no shotgun weddings! One has all the while to guard against confusion. There is a linguistic hocus-pocus by which we think we change things just by changing names. The notion that by "surrendered sovereignty" denominations would become "branches"—the Baptist, the Lutheran, the Disciples—could perpetuate many, if not all, the evils of denominationalism, thwart the values in them, and create some mean problems of its own.

Fundamentalism, racism, secularism are no respecter of branches. Exclusiveness, competition, "pride of will and lust of station": it is these that plague us. World and National Councils do the best they can: but their best is not good enough. The church must be and do and say something in and to this world, which in its disunited state it is not, does not,

and does not say: something commensurate with human need. It must speak with unmistakable spiritual authenticity to the condition of our world. The denomination is not normative but germinative for the church.

Federal Union is a dubious basis of union. This must be said, even when it is alleged that its author got the scheme directly and privately from God, and that other proposals can claim no such divine initiative. Federal Union has its cake and eats it too under an analogy to American history. Many a more Christian analogy is available. There is, for instance, that of the resurrection, with each denomination voluntarily dying and rising unto God, thus changed "in the twinkling of an eye." At all events, a political proposal is by no means the most persuasive for the church. Church union has actually taken place, and is currently occurring, on an entirely different basis: a basis other than a political one which, even if it worked, would still confront the judgment of history; a political one which hasn't gone anywhere much and hasn't been going too long. Church union is not *put* together. It *comes* together, out of insights and intuitions and inspirations, and especially, out of the Incarnation. It must have a freedom that is something far finer and deeper than federal.

V

We have taken this glance at Federal Union to indicate the attempts to conserve denominationalism in a bit more attractive form than the present, and to ward off complete church union as a pressing necessity. Is this, then, as far as we should go? Are denominations the last word? Is disunion, or a secondary or third-rate union, the best we can hope for?

Of all that has come from the life, labors, and leadings of our Lord, the church is the best. This is by no means to say that it is as good as it should be. Said the Madras Conference: "No one knows the failings, the pettiness, the faithlessness which infect the Church's life as do we who are its members. Yet, in all humility and penitence, we are constrained to declare to a baffled and needy world that the Church, under God, is its best hope." It is our profound concern that the best hope shall be the best it *can* be. Who will say that it is best now, or even good enough?

Charles Clayton Morrison has finely said that Jesus Christ deserves a body more worthy of his lordship. He deserves it because he is the truth. Whatever truth a denomination treasures has far more chance of acceptance, extension, and purification than within sectarian confines. He deserves it because he is the way. If other churches who so recognize him are seen to be as Christian as our own, and as sharing equality before God, our

differences will impress us less, and the brotherhood his Saviorhood makes possible will impress us more. Then our aim will not be to reach agreement about our differences, but so to unite the church that our differences will be atmosphered by his fellowship and faith, and entrusted to that highest of all solidarities, mutual "participation in the Holy Spirit." Our ventures will not then stand in his way! He deserves it because he is the life. The life of love for and loyalty to him, must be central. All else is secondary.

No experience in churchmanship can be fully Christian which is not on this exalted basis. These are the reasons why we aim at the highest possible union. If we fail, we shall at least know that we tried most for the best.

Biblical Authority in Contemporary Protestantism

CHARLES HARVEY ARNOLD

I. FROM BIBLICAL CRITICISM TO BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

WHEN, DURING THE FIRST WORLD WAR, Karl Barth became aware of the "strange new world in the Bible," he posed a very definite problem to the liberal Protestantism of that and the subsequent generation. The problem was basically theological and not critical, viz., the problem of "biblical authority." To a Protestantism that had been for at least two generations reading and criticizing the Bible as the "literature of genius," Barth's protest came as a scandal. Critical modernism was confounded at the brashness of this young Swiss pastor of Safenwil.¹

To many in that day, it seemed as if Barth would simply recommend that the patient, rigorous studies of historical criticism be canceled out. His *Römerbrief* was looked on as perhaps exposition of a type, but hardly as exegesis, and certainly not as criticism! Liberal Protestant theologians and scholars had long since abandoned any conception of biblical theology, and biblical "authority" was the preserve of the most intransigent conservatives. In the perspective of immanent idealism, the Bible was the literary deposit of a long historical and evolutionary struggle. American theologians of the liberal era had actually gotten not much further than Samuel Taylor Coleridge's dictum that the Bible is inspired if it inspires and "finds one."

This is not written to caricature the serious and costly work of devoted scholars and churchmen of that time now past. They often laid some deep foundations, that we cannot gainsay, and they fought some battles for academic and ecclesiastical freedom that will hold us in their debt for our lifetimes.

¹ Martin Kähler in an article about 1910 (*Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. II, "Biblical Theology") deplored the lack of concern for "biblical theology" in that era, as did Adolph Schlatter, who is sometimes called the "father of biblical theology." Barth was simply more of a prophetic preacher who brought this concern to a radical focus during the First World War.

CHARLES HARVEY ARNOLD, B.D., is Minister of the Plymouth Congregational Church, Danville, Illinois. In what sense, he asks, is the Bible authoritative?

We may say, however, with critical honesty, that they prematurely closed the scope and terms of their work in biblical and theological studies. In theology, they got as far as the "philosophy" of religion; biblically, they laid bare the "backgrounds" but never reached the "foreground" of deep biblical faith. In that era the Bible was almost never evaluated in any but historical and literary terms.

Biblical literature and drama, wisdom and poetry were studied. The prophets were studied diligently—more as social reformers than as spokesmen of faith. But the Bible as a document of faith was unheard of for the most part. Under critical eyes, the varieties of biblical religion showed up as plain as day. One critic discerned as many as fourteen in the biblical literature. That there was no fundamental unity in the Bible, and hence no theology and authority, was axiomatic. An extreme relativism pervaded Protestant biblical thinking. Revelation was impossible. Jesus Christ became the "Jesus of history." Paul became the "founder of Christianity." The Church became the laboratory where psychologists could study the "varieties of religious experience." Faith was impossible.

Barth's word of protest was inevitable and did not return to him void. Since 1918 the Bible, and the whole gamut of "problems" connected with it, has been reconsidered. Biblical theology has become the new perspective, under the inspiration of Continental and British, and now American scholars.² The critical task has not been abandoned as some have feared, nor has there been a reduction of textual work as one would think; e.g., the *Revised Standard Version* is a witness to this. What has happened is that serious concern has been given to the real underlying unity that is apparent in the midst of the diversity and variety of biblical religion. There is a new understanding of the meaning of revelation, of sin and grace, of covenant and community in the Old and New Testaments. They are no longer separate and disparate books, but one knit together by God's disclosure of himself in Christ and in a covenant people—the Church. We are not dealing with history as the tedious round of man's folly and futility, but with "holy history"—God's "mighty acts" and "God with us." Human history is looked at in the Bible from the "end" of history. This is eschatology.

² One must consider that there are still some biblical scholars of honesty and integrity who do not believe that a biblical "theology" is possible, e.g., W. A. Irwin and Roland E. Wolfe. The whole question was explored in a symposium in the *Journal of Bible and Religion* some ten years ago, and also in many articles in the *Journal of Religion* in recent years. Indeed, all theological and religious journals have been involved in the discussion in some way, from the more technical to the more popular. Dr. F. C. Grant, e.g., believes that the New Testament is "data" for a theology. (*Introduction to New Testament Thought*, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949.)

The Bible has, from this point of view, an authority. What is it? It is now our purpose to explore this authority and see its relevance for our day.⁸

II. BIBLICAL REALISM AND BIBLICAL BEHAVIORISM

The paramount question of biblical theology is that of the authority of the Bible, not *qua* "book," but as in some sense related to God's disclosure of himself to us. The one Protestant group that would most violently react against this new biblical recovery would be those who have the most profound attachment to the Bible as Book. We mean by this the "fundamentalists." More especially the "fundamentalists of the Word," or the biblical "behaviorists" if one may use an analogy from psychology. As an erstwhile "fundamentalist" myself, I must become confessional and describe this mentality that is so pervasive in American Protestantism. For to those who hold this view tenaciously, the question of biblical authority is crucial and determinative.

There are actually four types of "fundamentalism" in American Protestantism today. They are all involved in some way in our problem of biblical authority.

1. The first is the *fundamentalism of the Word*. Essentially, the fundamentalist mentality is that of a closed and authoritarian mind, whether it be in religion, politics, economics, or science. As concerns biblical authority and revelation, it is biblical "behaviorism." The Bible *is* God's Word, in grammar and syntax. God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit are simply enclosed in the verbal structure of the Book. The Word *is* the words. This is verbal inspiration leading to the cul-de-sac of verbal inerrancy. It has deep affinities with the Moslem attitude toward the Koran.

The believing heart (for it is deeply and emotionally attached to the Book) responds to the reading of and preaching from the Bible in very much the same formula as was used by Watsonian behaviorism: the Stimulus-Response bond. This Book, now become a fetish, conditions the response of the believer as Pavlov conditioned his dog. In its most radical form, this biblical literalism is even attached to a particular translation (which they do not call a "translation"), especially the Authorized Version, variously called by its more illiterate devotees the "St. James" or the "Book that Jesus wrote"! This accounts for the violent repudiation of the Revised

⁸ This "new" view may be called "biblical realism" for lack of a better term. If any should contend that the reviving biblical theology discredits "constructive, open-minded, sympathetic" literary and historical criticism, let him read especially Chapter III, "The Emancipation of the Word of God" and *passim* in Edwin Lewis' *Biblical Faith and Christian Freedom*, Westminster Press, 1953. He assures us that it is not a "revamped fundamentalism" (p. 44).

Standard Version especially since the Old Testament Section was published in September, 1952.⁴

This type of fundamentalism is the most vigorous and influential type in this country. It accounts for the "splinter" sects and "Bible churches" that have pulled away from orthodox denominations in the last quarter-century. Vigorous spokesmen have upheld it and caused unrest in seemingly conservative groups. Revivalism is its ethos. It has even gone sophisticated in some sections, and in other sections it has become chaplain to some forms of political fundamentalism and reaction. Legalism is its end product.

Let me amplify, autobiographically, this last statement that biblical behaviorism ends in legalism, e.g., the Bible as a whole and the "words" of Jesus are commands to be obeyed, the violation of which means everlasting punishment in a very literal hell. In my fundamentalist days I entered into a dispute with a member of my church about the Bible. I argued that it was not a legal code (liberalism had already taken hold of me at that point), that we could not "keep commandments," that not even the Hebrews could keep Ten Commandments, so how could we, as Christians? The Bible-believing elder with whom I was expostulating came back at me with this mandate: "Ten Commandments? All of the words of Jesus (and the New Testament) are commandments. We do not have ten, we have to keep ten thousand!" He went on, "And if we break one, we break all!" I might add that I was dismissed from my church that very night.

One very devout Christian of this persuasion hurled this word at me once: "I believe the Bible from cover to cover, and I even believe the covers!" This is actually more than legalism; it is a sort of black magic, a verbal voodooism.

Professor Emil Brunner summed up the whole tragedy of this development since the Reformation when he said that orthodoxy (which would be fundamentalism in America) had confused the fact of revelation with the witness to fact and made them identical.⁵

2. Second is the *fundamentalism of the Spirit*.

This corresponds to H. Richard Niebuhr's classification of the "unitarianism" of the Spirit (along with others of the Father and of the Son) in an article a few years ago. The "spiritualist" sects of the Reformation, e.g., the Anabaptists, parented this movement within Protestantism.

⁴ For many illustrations of this "literalism" see the excellent little book by Prof. J. Carter Swaim, *Right and Wrong Ways to Use the Bible*, Westminster Press, 1953, especially Chapter 7.

⁵ Brunner, E., *The Mediator*, Westminster Press, 1946, p. 34.

Thomas Müntzer, a fanatical prophet of this group in Germany, summed up the attitude of the spiritualists in these words: "Scripture is mere paper and ink. Bible, babble, bubble." The Bible was not authoritative at all; rather the "inner light," the Spirit, as he spoke immediately and unmediately to the soul, was the only authority for Christians. And often the Spirit seemed to speak in confusion, leading some to renounce war as a means of establishing God's Kingdom and others to take up arms (as in Münster) on its behalf.

Contemporary "holiness" sects are the fruitage of this type of fundamentalism. Biblical authority is at a minimum in these groups; the sanctifying, perfecting power of the Holy Spirit is the gift sought. The "Holy Spirit" is the direct authority for the sects of this lineage. Indeed, the very word "Spirit" invokes an enthusiastic response. They seem to be rather indifferent about the Bible. Their attitude on the Revised Standard Version generally has been "neutral." In a holiness convention meeting in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, recently the "new Bible" was neither accepted nor condemned. On the local radio here a spokesman for a more stable group of this order delivered a sermon on the Bible that could well have been delivered by a professor in any of our liberal or even neo-orthodox seminaries! His concern was for "Christ in you"—the Holy Spirit.

Needless to say that these sects (and their various proliferations) meet an emotional need that our more staid and classical Reformation Churches do not meet. Sociologically, they are inclusive of the "marginal" people of American Protestantism, especially in the rural and semi-rural areas. Theologically, they are often a reaction against the excessive biblicalism of the usual run of Protestant churches.

Our concern here is only with their relation to biblical authority, and as representative of a certain type of mind that we have called "fundamentalism."

3. Third we find the *fundamentalism of the Cultus*.

"High church" groups and extreme liturgists are tempted by this kind of closed-mind rigidity. The fetish of this group is a fixed liturgy or some organizational structure, or office, or polity that is deemed constitutive of the essence of the church. Forms, rituals, ceremonials, or some consecrated person are thought of as almost the exclusive channel of God's grace. One cannot deny that these media can be, or are, channels of grace, but when they are made determinative of the validity of the faith and order of the church, there is the danger of a very intransigent fundamentalism. A subtle "priestcraft" lurks in the background. Sacerdotalism of the *ex opero*

variety can, with some fairness, be charged to them. Of course, papal absolutism is the *ne plus ultra* of this kind of attitude.

Much of ecumenical discussion in recent years has been vitiated with this outlook. Those who champion this view are able and devout churchmen. They can discuss any area of biblical study or theological controversy with sanity and scholarship, but when the discussion comes to this point, they shut their brief cases and declare that the session is closed. Humbly, we may accuse them of pride!

An illustration of an incident within my recent experience will suffice to symbolize this situation, and point out, incidentally, how extremes can meet. Representing our local ministerial association, I was asked to contact two men to appear on an interdenominational worship service. One was a high church liturgist, the other a thoroughgoing "fundamentalist of the Word" (we were trying to be brotherly). Both refused to be on the platform—the one because our liturgy (*cultus*) was defective, the other because our faith was deficient. We were not in the "apostolic succession," and we were not "Bible believers." And some of the Holiness people would not fellowship with us because we did not have the "Spirit." So we had to depend on our defective, nonliturgical *cultus*, get a "modernist" to preach for us, and the Spirit, if present, did not come in Pentecostal power! This is not said in sarcasm, but to show that fundamentalism is a pervasive mood, and is common to some who would not shake hands if they met on the street.

4. Finally there is the *fundamentalism of a limited method*.

Ancient adage has it that yesterday's heresy is tomorrow's orthodoxy. In considering this variety of fundamentalism, the saying is true. The "liberal spirit" of the early part of this century, the vanguard of Protestant "modernism," is now in some of its champions a closed mind. In their fight against dogmatism, obscurantism, creedalism, conservatism, they became enamored of the seemingly omnicompetent methods of science. Was not science with its rigorous method dispelling ignorance and disease everywhere? What could withstand its assaults? Surely religion, especially the Christian religion and theology, could come to terms with this method and its world views, and then apply it to every area of human concern, and finally to every area of divine concern. At that time, John Dewey was speaking of scientific method in a reverent spirit as the only solution to *all* of our human problems. Science was rapidly becoming a religion, its liturgy the empirical method, its deity the cosmic *élan*. To many of the early liberals religion, investigated by this method, became man's response

to the cosmic forces that evoked awe in him. Historical method, so useful in other fields, was applied to the Bible, the creeds and the content of Christian theology. Much of this was healthful and needed, and we cannot gainsay that.

But the inevitable happened. These theologians and philosophers of religion hastily (and this was very "unscientific") closed the circle after their initial successes and sat back to view their victories. They prematurely thought that the battle was won, nor were they aware that this method was beginning to crystallize in their touch, and that their minds were likewise closing to all other evidences of faith and revelation. Their work was prolegomena and not conclusion. These men wrote the great psychologies, histories, philosophies, and sociologies of religion—all scientific disciplines. Obviously, neither a theology based on revelation, nor faith as a response to that revelation, nor even the Bible as the document of that revelation, is amenable to the procedures of scientific method. But these scholars were strangely unaware of this!

Today, we are not so confident that science has the answer to all of our problems; nor are all of the scientists. The scientists, especially the physicists, have seen an apocalypse in atomic—and they deeply fear for man.

In recent years among liberal Protestants there has been a feeling of bafflement. The old battle between "fundamentalism and modernism" is over. A new and different spirit has emerged that has challenged both. Revelation is back, and so is theology; the Bible is receiving renewed interest, but from the standpoint of theology, not so much from that of historical criticism. Men are pondering once again ideas about the grace of God and human sin, faith and hope, and the Church as the body of Christ.

Some of the erstwhile liberals who were engrossed with the scientific method have gone "beyond" it. But some, especially those who became extreme naturalists (and humanistic), feel that with the coming of a theological renaissance they have been betrayed, that their comrades in arms have capitulated to medievalism, and beyond, to the Dark Ages. The late George A. Coe called it an "anti-scientific reaction."

To illustrate: one of these great worthies, who fought long and hard to establish the scientific method in religion heard a group of divinity students talking about "theology." With a hurt gasp and with a benign look, he said to the theologues, "Theology is to science what alchemy was to chemistry—*theology is obsolete!*" Later, he told another group that if they wanted to get at truth, to get at it by the only valid method that befits the dignity of enlightened men: "Science!" he thundered.

Another proponent of the scientific method in theology (or he would call it "religion") said in the classroom of a front-rank divinity school that the way to determine what happens in a service of Holy Communion was simply to measure the reactions of the communicants with a sphygmomanometer and chart the results!

Dr. William Robinson in a recent article in the *Christian Century* referred to this attitude as it finds expression in contemporary liberals enthralled by the spirit of science, the "new fundamentalism." A method has become a fetish, and this too is a type of fundamentalism. And one may say a very dangerous type, because it is highly intellectual, and as such stands on the verge of being a new "gnosticism." It can be, and often is, as intolerant as the fundamentalism of any other stripe, because it is essentially the same devotion to a limited method or way of thinking.

What is said above about liberalism is not to be taken as characteristic of *all* Protestant liberalism, but only those aspects which accepted almost uncritically the scientific method, which is admittedly a limited method. Nor should one come to the conclusion that there was nothing *positive* in liberalism. There was, and is, much that must be retained in any present-day theological reconstruction, either systematically or biblically.

Let us enumerate some of those gains here—without documentation, for that would carry us beyond the scope of this paper.

(1) Liberalism was broadly "personalistic" in its underlying philosophy. It attempted to be evangelical in its theology, or better, to be a liberal evangelicalism.

(2) Its concern for freedom was thoroughly Christian and biblical. It was a sincere attempt to explore the full meaning of that freedom that is in Christ. To know the truth is to be free; such is the ethos of liberalism.

(3) Liberalism in its more vital forms has been critical of itself and has sought a larger synthesis. The symposium *Liberal Theology* (1942), edited by H. P. Van Dusen and D. E. Roberts, is indicative of a "neo-liberalism" that has many affinities with neo-orthodoxy and biblical theology (e.g., the articles by John Bennett and Henry Sloane Coffin).

(4) Liberalism was a healthy reaction to the oppressive and obscurantist Protestantism that dominated the churches in the early part of this century. The "social gospel" was desperately needed against the next-worldly pietism that has misdirected us so often. The struggle for a free pulpit is our most direct heritage, for the freedom to preach the Word of God is an unsurpassable gain.

The danger and temptation of fundamentalism of any variety, as well

as of any human achievement, is idolatry. Toynbee would call it the idolization of an ephemeral mode, or institution or technique. Even neo-orthodoxy and the developing biblical theology that has stemmed from it could eventuate in idolatry, if it sought and seeks a premature way to enclose the truth of Christian revelation. If prophetic criticism remains its ethos as it has in the past, it can avoid this temptation. Only the grace of God can ultimately save all of us from our pretensions of omniscience. Our response to this beneficence can only be that of humility and the humor of finitude.

III. BIBLICAL AUTHORITY FOR TODAY

In the World Council of Churches the place of the Bible and its authority has loomed large. Almost every discussion, in all of its commissions, finally came back to this basic question: What is the authority of the Bible? Even in groups that discussed social action and international problems the discussion always returned to biblical "ethics" and consequently to biblical authority.

After a conference of theologians and laymen, meeting at Oxford in the summer of 1949, the Council issued *The Bible and the Church's Message*, which later was enlarged into a full volume, *Biblical Authority for Today*, edited by W. Schweitzer and A. Richardson. The entire gamut of biblical problems is considered in this work prepared by scholars from every branch of Christendom except the Roman Catholic. Biblical interpretation and exegesis, theology, ethics, relevancy, and authority are studied with rigorous methods. Deep foundations are laid for a new consideration of biblical authority in our time.

A mountain of books published in the last decade or so points to this upsurging biblical revival. One may mention but a few titles here: H. H. Rowley, *The Rediscovery of the Old Testament*; Norman Snaith, *Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*; H. Cunliffe-Jones, *The Authority of the Biblical Revelation*; Paul Minear, *Eyes of Faith*; Millar Burrows, *Outline of Biblical Theology*; B. W. Anderson, *Rediscovering the Bible*; G. Ernest Wright, *The Challenge of Israel's Faith*; Floyd Filson, *One Lord, One Faith*; Rupert Davies, *Biblical Authority in the Continental Reformers*. Mention could be made of the work of Wheeler Robinson, W. J. Phythian-Adams, A. G. Hebert, and certainly C. H. Dodd's solid works since he wrote *The Authority of the Bible* in 1929.⁶ On the Con-

⁶ Two fine articles on "Biblical Authority" in two larger works must not be overlooked: T. W. Manson, "The Nature and Authority of the Canonical Scriptures" in *A Companion to the Bible*, 1939, and Herbert Farmer, "The Bible: Its Significance and Authority" in *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. I, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1952.

tinent the works in biblical theology of Walter Eichrodt, Wilhelm Vischer, Rudolf Bultmann, and Oscar Cullmann must be considered by all serious students of theology.

With these works as background, we must attempt a constructive statement on biblical authority that avoids the extremes of leveling the Book "up" (as in extreme biblicism) and of leveling the Book "down" (as in extreme liberalism). No finality is claimed for these views; they simply represent the results of one man's study of this vital problem over a period of some fifteen years.

Biblical criticism and biblical theology are both in agreement on one thing: the Bible *is* the Church's book, whichever way we look at it. It represents the literature of a movement, later canonized by the Church as authoritative Scripture. But the Scripture is more than a literary deposit. The Church produced it and later used it as authority (though not in the first century) in its thinking and living. As Herbert Farmer said, the Bible is (and was) "organic" to the Church and the revelation it has received. As such, it is normative for the Church, normative and corrective as none of its other literature can be.

This is because the canonical Scriptures are apostolic or near-apostolic; and the apostles are the fountainhead of the early Church. "Built on the foundation of the apostles and the prophets" is the rule of faith for the Church for all time. Though underlying this is an eternal foundation: Jesus Christ. "Other foundation can no man lay" than this: that Jesus Christ is Lord of the Church. Therefore this book is a deposit of apostolic witness and the Church is "one, holy, catholic and apostolic." In a genuine sense then, the "Bible" is the Church's book as no other book can be, for it is the work of the many "witnesses" of the apostolic age (Heb. 12:1ff).

The Bible is the paramount witness to the Word of God—Jesus Christ. This witnessing character is everywhere apparent in the writings of the New Testament. They purport to be no more. When the Fourth Evangelist wrote, "In the beginning was the Word" (the Logos), "the Word became flesh," he was bearing witness to the gracious disclosure of God in a person, in Jesus Christ. As he said of John the Baptist, that he came to bear witness, so he was actually bearing witness to both as agents of God's revelation. The Talmud said, "The Torah speaks the language of men" (*Babylonian Talmud*, Berakhot 316). Here in the Christian faith God does not so much speak the language of man: he *is* man in Jesus Christ. "The Word becomes flesh" and "dwells" among us, something that could never be said of the Torah, or of Allah for that matter. Thus,

the Bible witnesses not to a revelation that communicates eternal truth to men, but to a revelation that is redemptive, reconciling man to God and bringing man into fellowship with God in Jesus Christ.

Christ as the Word of God creates the Church as the Church creates the book that is witness to its faith. Christ as the Word, then, is constitutive of the Church's life and thought as he is of the Bible that speaks of him as Lord. This has led some Continental theologians, e.g., W. Vischer, to construct a "typology" which finds Christ to a great extent in the Old Testament; others would find a special "witness" to Christ in the Old Testament.⁷

The authority for the Christian Church is ultimately that of God's revelation in Christ. Revelation is a whole complex of events: the incarnation, crucifixion and resurrection, the coming of the Holy Spirit. Through, and in, these events, God "acts" and "speaks."⁸ Witness and testimony are made to the events and they are regarded as "saving" acts of God. When this testimony is written in a book, or letter or tract (as in the New Testament) and published abroad, then and only then can we speak of the "written word of God." Which is another way of saying "a writing about" the Word of God, or "written" witness.

Preaching as the heralding of the mighty saving acts of God's grace is oral witness, and is authoritative as it finds depth and power in the Word of God as revealed. Manifestly, the authority is not in the preacher as person. He is, as H. H. Farmer reminds us, "Servant of the Word," and as James S. Stewart says, "Herald of God." What more exalted titles could be conferred on us than these? Not even Doctor of Divinity!

Let it be clear here that in talking about the authority of the Bible, we are not thinking about an external, coercive authority imposed upon us. Revelation requires response, comprehension, appropriation. Calvin was certainly right when he spoke of the "internal testimony of the Holy Spirit" that helps us grasp the power of God's revelation. The only thing *coercive* about it is that we cannot completely evade him once we encounter him. It becomes "like fire shut up in our bones." But God's Word in Christ is persuasive, and he is long-suffering. God's Word is the "saving" Word.

All authority requires *interpretation*. If God uses the "human words" of the Bible (and Barth reminds us that they are such) to speak his Word, then the Bible is a book that must be interpreted—which the biblical

⁷ Certainly we could say with Reinhold Niebuhr that the Old Testament "expects" a Messiah (Christ), but we must avoid any prophetic "determinism" in this respect.

⁸ We could use the word "encounter" when man faces God's claims in Christ.

fundamentalists, of course, violently deny. As instruments of interpretation, historical and literary criticism are indispensable, though introductory. It is precisely the task of theology, biblically, systematically and practically as preaching, to interpret the Bible and hear through its fallible human words the eternal Word, made flesh in Jesus Christ and indwelling the Church as the Holy Spirit. This, to me, is the whole significance of Karl Barth's manifesto to us in this era. We are preachers (not church administrators, village sages, or psychiatrists) and "confessional" theologians above everything else. And we must accept this unashamedly and without falling under the lure to be something or somebody else. This is the "high calling" in Christ; it is a "noble employ," to use the phrase of an old New England preacher.

Interpretation is not entirely an intellectual process. We have put much emphasis upon "reading" the Bible and "studying" the Bible. Interpretation is an emotional, spiritual process also. It requires that we "listen" to the Word through the words of the Bible. It requires further that we not only "listen" but at times that we speak back, that we "talk back." This is the dialogue between man and God, between God and man. Man is "addressable" (in Barth's word), but he is also responsive and responsible when he hears God speak. Inevitably, our response as men must be that of Isaiah: "Here am I, send me." The Word addressed to us first cleanses and purges from us our unholy and mixed motives, the little egotisms and self-justifications, the temptation to escape from God as Jonah attempted to do. Under the grace of God's Word, we are clothed in our right minds and set on our feet and sent on a pilgrimage to bear witness to this amazing thing that has come to pass.

God still speaks! Revelation can never stop as long as God is available to us in the Holy Spirit. And the Spirit is the revealer (I Cor. 2:10). He reveals Christ to us as the Word, and Christ reveals to us God the Creator. Once again we are "in the beginning." And "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." The Bible speaks about these deep things, and it is with the Bible that *we must begin.*

"Jesus Said"

WILLARD L. SPERRY

I

DURING THE YEARS 1904-07 I was a theological student at Queen's College, Oxford. I was fortunate in having Burnett Hillman Streeter as my tutor.

Streeter was at the time a member of a Seminar conducted by Canon Sanday of Christ Church, which he had convened to study the "Synoptic Problem," i.e., the interrelation and literary interdependence of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Sanday gathered for this purpose a dozen of the best New Testament scholars in England. They came from Cambridge and London as well as from Oxford itself.

Streeter had awakened in me an interest in the problem to which the Seminar was addressing itself, and finally took me in to its sessions, under the wing of his gown. Most of its work was an effort to determine the authenticity of the Gospel sayings accredited to Jesus. I have never again met any kindred academic venture as careful and as sincere. The memory of those hours remains as a discipline in honesty. The natural sciences could hardly have made a greater claim to precise thinking.

In the very nature of the case, the Fourth Gospel did not come under consideration. There was no interest whatsoever in the pious attempt to arrange some harmony of the Gospels in which the Fourth Gospel should be included as of a kind with the other three. It was plainly recognized that the "Synoptic Problem" is one thing and the "Johannine Problem" another and very different thing. Since that day I have never been able to think of all four Gospels as being mere variants of a single pattern.

One of the present practices of preachers and writers which puzzles me is their uncritical use of the Fourth Gospel as a source book for the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus. Many, if not most, of the sayings of Jesus in John are prefaced by the caption, "Jesus said." But no one who ever sat with the Sanday seminar can help wondering whether that statement is

WILLARD L. SPERRY, M.A., D.D., D.Litt., was till recently Dean and Professor of Practical Theology at Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, Massachusetts. In retirement he is keeping up his interest in studies with which this paper is concerned, as well as the subject of public worship.

literally true. John 14 is one of the most beloved chapters in the Gospels, yet it is a fair question whether or not its actual words are as authentic as those in the Sermon on the Mount.

Just at the time when the Seminar was hardest at its work, James Drummond, at that time Principal of Manchester College, Oxford, published a book on *The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel* (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904). The ideal book on John has never been written; it is doubtful whether it ever can be written. But among the many books on John this still remains one of the best. It was, and is, the more striking because Drummond was a Unitarian.¹ His appraisal of John was conservative rather than critically liberal. He believed in its apostolic authorship, and therefore in its fidelity to original fact in many of the incidents and sayings not recorded in the Synoptics. Drummond had a sensitive feeling for the truth and beauty of the more meditative, and even mystical, teaching of Jesus as found in this Gospel. He accepts as his premise the distinction made by the Fathers of the early Church that the Synoptic Gospels are "grammatical," i.e., historical, while John is a "spiritual" Gospel, a free interpretation of the life and words of Jesus.

In an early chapter of the book he points out in detail some of the differences between the Johannine record and that of the Synoptics. I venture to list these items.

1. The Synoptics seem to suggest for Jesus a ministry of only one year, since they mention but one Passover. John mentions three Passovers.

2. The ministry of Jesus in the Synoptics centers in Galilee; in John its scene is mainly in Jerusalem.

3. In the Synoptics, Peter identifies Jesus as the Messiah only midway in the record. In John, Jesus stands revealed as the Messiah in the first chapter at the very beginning of the ministry. There is therefore in John no unfolding of the Messianic consciousness, so there are no injunctions to guard the Messianic secret.

4. In John the temple is cleansed at the beginning of the ministry; in the Synoptics at the end of the ministry.

5. In John the Last Supper is observed on 13 Nisan and the crucifixion follows on the 14th. In the Synoptics these dates are 14 and 15 Nisan.

¹ I have often noticed that among visiting preachers at the Harvard Church our Unitarian guests make the most constant and—from my standpoint—the most uncritical use of John's Gospel. I once mentioned this to my late colleague James Hardy Ropes, saying that I should have supposed the "high" orthodoxy of John would have made that gospel uncongenial to Unitarians. He said, "You miss the whole point. In so far as the Transcendentalism of the mid-nineteenth century still survives, John's Gospel is the most Unitarian of all four."

6. In John the miracles are exhibitions of Jesus' Messianic power, not acts of mercy prompted by compassion. They are intended to create faith, and do not presuppose faith on the part of the sufferer. Furthermore, the Johannine miracles are more often than otherwise used as the occasion for discourses on their "spiritual" connotation. Thus the teaching about "the bread of life" follows the feeding of the multitude, and is not identified with the observance of the Last Supper.

7. John has no stories of the birth and infancy. The place they have in the Synoptics is taken by the majestic prologue about the pre-existent Word (the "Logos").

8. No mention of a Baptism with water.

9. No account of a Temptation.

10. No Agony in the Garden. These earthly vicissitudes in the life of Jesus, as recorded in the Synoptics, were not, and could not be consonant with the passionless experience of the incarnate Logos.

11. In John many of the discourses pass imperceptibly from words imputed to Jesus to the author's own reflections on those words. Yet the literary texture remains uniform. It is hard to say when Jesus is supposed to have left off speaking and the author takes over.

12. The most characteristic words of Jesus in the Synoptics take the form of the parable. There are no parables in John; what may have been parables reappear as allegories. Thus the parables about shepherds are replaced by the unequivocal words, "I am the good shepherd."

13. In the Synoptics Jesus seldom refers to himself. In John he is constantly referring to himself. The word *Ego* in the Greek text is used 117 times in John, but relatively few times in the Synoptics. It is only fair to say that this usage of the first person which is so characteristic of John may fairly be said to be implicit in the Synoptic third person, but the accent differs.

14. The central idea of the Synoptics is that of the Kingdom of Heaven. The Kingdom is almost never mentioned in John, and it is replaced by the idea of "eternal life."

15. There is no eschatology in John to continue that of the Synoptics, and no expectation of a speedy Second Advent. This whole body of Synoptic teaching is replaced by that about the "Paraclete" (the "Comforter").²

² A similar and even longer list of such differences is to be found in a recent book, *The Gospel of the Spirit*, by Ernest C. Colwell and Eric L. Titus, Harper & Brothers, 1953, pp. 32-34.

II

Some of these differences are relatively unimportant and do not affect our modern faith and practice. Others, however, present us with genuine dilemmas. We can hardly have it both ways; and having come to a parting of the ways, we have to decide which way we shall go.

On the whole the most important of these distinctions is that between the Kingdom of Heaven and eternal life. Jesus himself can hardly have kept these two ideas or ideals in some sort of equipoise in his own mind and taught both with the same emphasis.

It is often said that all great religions are more or less the same, and that despite superficial differences they come out to the same thing. This may be true, but they reach their goal by different routes. The most important contrast between these religions is their evaluation of time. For some of them time is real, often intensely real, and is the necessary medium through which God reveals himself and realizes his will. For others, time is unreal. It is an uneasy sleep troubled with meaningless dreams from which we may hope to waken into the stillness of eternity. Judaism, the earliest Christianity, Mohammedanism, and Zoroastrianism stress the reality and religious importance of time. The religious philosophies of Greece and the religions of the Orient deny the reality of time and propose to help us escape from it. John's Gospel probably owes nothing to Oriental religions. How much it owes to Greek thought is an open question. In any case it stands in this matter in rather sharp contrast to the Synoptics and, indeed, to biblical thought as a whole.

The Jesus of the Synoptics "goes on his way today and tomorrow and the day following" (Luke 13:33). The Blessed Damozel, says the poet, looked down from the battlements of heaven and saw "time like a pulse shake fierce through all the worlds." That is the first impression always left after a rereading of the record of Holy Week. We can feel the fierce beating of the pulse of time. In general the Synoptics envisage a beginning, middle, and ending of the sequence of events in time. The end of the age is near, the advent of the Kingdom imminent.

In John there is no such expectation. We may pass here and now from our temporal life into life eternal. That state is a quality of life, not a period of life. This Johannine idea provided for Christians at the beginning of the second century relief from what must have been at first their bitter disappointment and sense of frustration at the failure of this world to come to an end, and the failure of Jesus to reappear bodily on the clouds of heaven to take over the rule of his realized Kingdom. Some

such transition was inevitable, and John makes it without labeling it as such. The Gospel had to be accommodated to a world that was going on, and thus committed to the prospective guidance of the Spirit of Christ.

For us, today, perhaps the most difficult question in Gospel criticism is presented by the prominence of the eschatological-apocalyptic teaching in the Synoptics. Did Jesus say the words which in this connection are attributed to him? If so, Schweitzer says that in the cry of dereliction on the cross Jesus saw this whole scheme of things collapse in ruins around his head. Therefore, many critics have said that, although the expectations implied by this problematical material in the Synoptics were undoubtedly part of the mentality of the first disciples, it is doubtful whether Jesus held these beliefs. Professor George Foot Moore once said to me that Jesus was much too sane a man to have been carried away by the ideas which we find in Mark 13. That passage, with its parallels and incidental sayings of the same sort, were introduced into the Gospels by the editor-authors of the Synoptics. This is a convenient solution of an otherwise embarrassing problem. I wish I could believe that it is true; but I have never been able to think that we are justified in pulling this particular woof out of the warp of the Synoptics simply because it is not convenient or credible today. It seems more probable that Jesus' mind was conditioned in part by the apocalyptic thought of much of the Judaism of his own day.

Aside from the faith of Adventist circles, most contemporary Christian thinking belongs with John rather than the Synoptics. Puzzled by the inconclusiveness of the history of our times, most of us have preached Easter sermons on the idea of eternal life rather than a realized heaven at the end of history, and as the destiny of our individual lives.

But I venture to point out that the present neo-orthodox despair of history and its despair of moral effort in time means a radical break with historic Christianity thus far. Our religion faced this problem in the second century when the influx of Gentiles into the Church threatened to shift the Christian emphasis from the Kingdom to the classical Greek concern for eternal life. Professor Burkitt says that at the end of the second century the Church, under the leadership of Irenaeus, determined to go on writing the annals of God in time.

There are few intimate decisions which the contemporary believer has to make which are as difficult as the choice between these two interpretations of our religion. The choice, one way or the other, will determine the whole conduct of a man's life as a would-be Christian. The times

are so difficult and so inconclusive that it often seems the part of devout common sense to give up any further attempt to make Christian history. Is it not wiser and better to concern oneself individually with the cultivation of one's own "Interior Castle" (Saint Teresa) as against further quest for the elusive Kingdom of God on earth as in heaven? The temptation to do so is great, and the warrant for so doing seems equally great.

The Gospels, as they stand, do not give us unequivocal words of Jesus at this point. But I venture to point out that the history of the last forty years has given to the eschatological-apocalyptic scheme of things a fresh vitality and apparent validity. Events have been happening within that framework to a far greater extent than we would have thought possible fifty years ago. When we now read Mark 13, we can only say that life is like that, uncongenial though we may find this fact. The present widespread interest in mysticism and in the religions of the Orient represents an equally widespread despair of our ability to further by our own efforts the coming of the Kingdom. Should these tempers prevail, the resultant religion, as far as American Protestantism is concerned, would be a religion of a very different kind from that in which we have hitherto believed and have tried to practice. In short, are we going to try, in the face of our present sense of frustration, to go on writing the annals of God in our times, or are we escaping into the stillness of an ever-uneventful eternity?

III

Let me take one more single illustration of a similar issue. The late William Temple, as presiding officer, used to interrupt the sessions of the Faith and Order Conference at its Edinburgh meeting to say, "God wills unity." Some streak of Nonconformity in my tradition or temperament always prompted me to ask, "How does he know that?" At least, does he know that the will of God can be realized within the particular terms which were the premises of our movement?

The historic creeds of the Church were drafted not to include as many as possible, but to exclude some, who had been classified as heretics. So with our churches. Every organized institution must have tests for membership. Otherwise membership in the society is meaningless. From this standpoint the World Council of Churches is fully warranted in setting up its theological tests for membership. But it should always be remembered that these tests are by no means all-inclusive. I told William Temple at the time of the Edinburgh meeting that I did not think any of us had any right, historical or moral, to impose his own particular the-

ological tests for membership in the movement upon any religious body. If a church professed and called itself Christian, it should be admitted to the ecumenical society on its own recognizance. If it were not willing to call itself Christian, it had no reason to ask or expect membership, since this was a distinctively Christian society.

But Temple would not agree to this very lax criterion. Hence, the ecumenical movement seems to me to be operating within a closed circle. Such a circle may be necessary for the solidarity and survival of any organized institution. But I have never been able to dismiss from my mind an awareness of the existence of sheep which are "not of this fold," when we dare to think about "the will of God" in such matters.

Many of the briefs for the ecumenical movement appeal to the intercessory prayer of Christ in John 17: "that they all may be one." In so far as Jesus stood in the line of the prophets as a spokesman for God, those words of the prayer may, perhaps, be accepted as an intimation of the will of God. But once again, how far can we rely upon the letter of that chapter? We may all agree that it is one of the most mature and loveliest transcripts of "the mind of Christ" in the New Testament. Indeed, Principal Drummond says that it has no parallel or equal. If, however, it is to be accredited to Jesus as it stands, there is the baffling problem of the means of its transmission to the text. Presumably the prayer was offered in private. If so, did Jesus afterward tell his disciples what he had prayed for? Or did some disciple overhear the prayer at the time it was offered and make a transcript of it? The simplest way to answer questions like that is not to ask them in the first instance.

Even if we are prepared to say that these are the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, there is reason for doubting whether the words, "that they all may be one," are concerned with what we know today as the problem of church unity. St. Paul did have occasion to face a nascent disunity within the institutional church and to stress, therefore, the necessity for church unity. As far as organized Christianity is concerned, he was the founder of Christianity, even though Jesus may have been its occasion and a warrant for its inevitability.

Given the heart of John 17, it seems probable that the intercession "that they all may be one" concerns the unity of each believer with Christ and through Christ with God. Thus, "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." The unity of all believers might follow as a corollary of this experience, but it may well have been a secondary rather than a primary concern of the

prayer. We must all agree that the Jesus of the Synoptics has little or nothing to say about "the church." Apologists for the church unity movement undoubtedly feel that if they can appeal to Jesus as the historical author of their movement their case is thereby strengthened. Yet one cannot help wondering whether that case can be made or ought to be made on the basis of the specific words which so often follow the Johannine preface, "Jesus said." One has no wish to deny the relevance of John 17 in this connection, but ought we not to accept the fact that this prayer is a mature interpretation of "the mind that was in Christ Jesus," an inevitable and precious consequence of that mind, rather than a phonographic record of its words as originally spoken?

IV

I have been told that at the end of his life Canon Sanday was a rather disappointed man. As a scholar he had spent long years in a study of the Gospels. He belonged to the generation which believed that if the historicity of Jesus could be established, and more particularly if the words attributed to Jesus in the Gospels could be authenticated, then we could be certain that the foundations of the Christian religion were assured. Sanday and his fellow workers had good reason to think that on the field of biblical criticism they had won a real victory. But apparently Sanday felt that it might be only a Pyrrhic victory. For he lived just long enough to see Christian thinking beginning to move away from meticulous literary criticism to the wider and more general field of systematic theology.

The latter emphasis has for the past forty years been superseding the prior interest in the quest for the Jesus of history. The Fourth Gospel in its own day and in its own way superseded the Synoptics. It was inevitable that this should happen, since the first three Gospels, given the history of Christian thought as a whole, were of themselves an imperfect transcript of Christianity. They needed the elaboration and interpretation given them by St. Paul, and by the author of John and their countless successors.

On the other hand we are living in a time when good usage, to say nothing of good morals, expects a speaker or writer to be accurate in the matter of quotations. We do not trust the mental processes of a man who is careless in this matter: many of us have been challenged, and rightly so, at this point. The uncritical acceptance of the sayings credited to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is warranted on the ground that there is what is now called "biblical theology." That term seems to presuppose some single co-ordinated system of religious faith and practice. But those

words are little more than an incantation. There is no such system. There are various theologies in the Bible and they are by no means uniform. So with the subject immediately under discussion. The Jesus of John is by no means the same person as the Jesus of the Synoptics. What has been called "the Galilean accent" is not heard in John, and it is not merely the accent that is gone, the actual substance of the words is often different.

Now I am not suggesting that preacher or writer should give up using the Fourth Gospel as source material for sermons or books. But, personally, I should feel more confidence in a man's mental processes if, when he cites the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel, he should indicate that he knows that there still is a "Johannine problem" within the blanket term "biblical theology." He cannot turn aside from what may be his major concern to state that problem at length and then try to answer it, before going on with his argument. But, in his sermons, he should from time to time suggest that he is aware of the difference between the words of Jesus as recorded in the Synoptics and the words of Jesus as cited in John.

Not that the former words are fully "Christian" and the latter words non-Christian. If a man feels that his case is strengthened by quoting authenticated words of Jesus, he might well preface his citations from John by saying, "The Christ of the Fourth Gospel says . . ." Failure to do something of the sort would seem to suggest either ignorance of the whole problem of John and the Synoptics, or else a slack conscience in the use of his source material. The author of John knew what he was doing when he recast the parables and epigrams of the Synoptics in the literary form which is so characteristic of his Gospel. He certainly made explicit in his Gospel much that was implicit in the older material on which he drew, and in his own personal memories, if he was himself an apostle. There is more to the Christian religion than was told in the life and words of Jesus as recorded in the first three Gospels. But in so far as the elaboration and interpretation of "the mind of Christ" in all later writings are concerned, John's Gospel included, they should not do violence to the Synoptics.

This is not a matter of what is, at the moment, a rather worn-out instance of the excesses of a too pedantic higher criticism, and the inadequacy of the type of Gospel study to which Sanday and his colleagues gave themselves. We should still be prepared to explain just what we mean when we make use of the words which, in the Fourth Gospel, are prefaced by the caption, "Jesus said."

Is Religious Education Obsolete?

HOWARD GRIMES

IS RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OBSOLETE? This question may seem like an absurd one, for in no period of the history of the Christian Church has there been a greater emphasis on the education of both the young and the mature. The elaborate machinery which we have set up for producing curriculum materials for the churches; the organization both nationally and locally which keeps our church educational enterprises going; the building of expensive "educational buildings"; the gap between the demand for and the supply of Directors of Religious Education—all of these facts make it unlikely that Religious Education is about to be relegated by the churches to a place of oblivion.

Further, it is true that if Religious Education is thought of as another term for Christian teaching (*didache*) then it is obviously here to stay. Christian teaching is as old as the Christian movement itself. There is reason to consider Jesus more of a teacher than a preacher. Paul *proclaimed* the Word of God (*kerygma*), but he also recognized the necessity of the longer and more tedious matter of teaching. Throughout the New Testament period and that of the early Church, teaching was an important function of those set aside to minister to persons already in the fellowship as well as to those seeking to enter.¹

The term "Religious Education," however, has come to mean for many people something specialized, a particular movement, a modern manifestation of the attempt of the church through the centuries to communicate the truth of the gospel through teaching. It is identified with the effort to effect a more psychologically sound and technically correct approach to Christian teaching, set in a particular frame of reference theologically. Religious Education in this sense is the modern movement led by George Albert Coe, William Clayton Bower, Herbert Betts, Harrison Elliott, Ernest J. Chave, and others, and is, to put it briefly, "life-centered" instead of "content-centered." When the term is used in this

¹ For a good presentation of the teaching emphasis in the early Church, see Lewis J. Sherrill, *The Rise of Christian Education*, The Macmillan Company, 1944, Chapters IV-VII.

HOWARD GRIMES, B.D., S.T.M., Ph.D., is Assistant Professor of Religious Education at the Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, and editor of the *Perkins School of Theology Journal*.

manner, it is not inappropriate to ask the question, "Is Religious Education obsolete?"

Failure to recognize that this movement is being challenged today is to be unaware of what is happening in theological seminaries and what is being written in the area of biblical and theological thought. Two forces in particular have arisen to challenge the type of Christian teaching fathered by Coe.

First, there is the new emphasis on the message of the Bible (Biblical Theology) as being the heart of that which we must communicate within the fellowship of the Church. This attempt to redefine what the Bible says is not necessarily opposed to attempts to relate the Bible to life today, and indeed it may encourage such thinking. The tendency, however, is to begin not with the experiences of the learner, as progressive Religious Education seeks to do, but rather with the given of the Bible. Further, the Bible is taken much more seriously than many religious educators have taken it.

Second, there is the new theology, born and bred in Europe but now rather completely rooted in American thought. This theology challenges Religious Education especially by its lower estimate of man's potentialities and by its questions concerning the possibilities of growth into the Christian life. Thus, while religious educators tend to look with suspicion on the increasing interest in this new theology, the theologians in the new trend look with distrust toward those concerned with Christian teaching, and Religious Education, once proclaimed as the savior of the church, is questioned as a usurper in disguise.

THE CLIMATE IN WHICH MODERN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AROSE

It is impossible to understand the modern Religious Education movement without seeing it in relation to the climate in which it arose. There are two foci of this climate, the first of which is general education. Under the influences of Pestalozzi and Froebel, and to a lesser extent Herbart, radical changes began to occur in American education during the latter years of the nineteenth century. These influences were crowned by that of John Dewey in the early years of the present century. It is difficult to describe in a few words this new emphasis. Perhaps it can be stated most simply by saying that content became a means to the end rather than the end itself in teaching. The growth of the individual child in a social setting was made the primary purpose in education. Dewey himself would never have gone so far as some educators have in the direction of the

minimizing of content. Nevertheless, he did emphasize the concept of social growth and development as the purpose of general education.²

Under the impact of these changes in general education, education in the churches began to change. The curriculum of Religious Education was no longer primarily the transmission of the heritage of the church but, to use Bower's term, "enriched and controlled experience."³ The achievement of character was substituted for the former emphasis on salvation and redemption. Christian teaching became, therefore, the attempt to lead the child, youth, or adult into the practice of Christian virtues, with the content of the faith a means to this end.⁴

The second aspect of this climate is the theological thinking that was prevalent as the movement arose. Biblical criticism was just beginning to be felt by American churchmen in the early days of the Religious Education movement. The optimism of Spencerian social evolution seemed realistic in view of the progress that was evident. The effect of Horace Bushnell's *Christian Nurture* began to be felt, and the liberalizing influence of Ritschl and Schleiermacher led to a higher estimate of man's capacity. The theology of the Kingdom of God (perhaps more properly called the "Kingdom of Man") and of the brotherhood of man provided a climate quite fitting for a concept of education which emphasized progressive growth and questioned the necessity of the redemptive work of any force outside the person himself.

Actually most religious educators minimized the importance of theology altogether. Many of them failed to see that they actually were operating on the basis of a theology which emphasized action and doing, ethics and social reform, man's potentialities and the possibility of a social utopia. Without a serious doctrine of "original sin," they tended to think that good "influences" were sufficient in order to produce character, and the brotherhood of man was a realizable human achievement. The Sermon on the Mount was exalted; the letters of Paul were either ignored or considered somewhat out of date. Character was the key word; salvation was taboo.

It should be noted that few if any churches adopted these ideas in their extreme form into their curriculums. The most extreme expression they received was in the report of the Bower Committee, adopted by the

² Cf. Elliott, Harrison S., *Can Religious Education Be Christian?* The Macmillan Company, 1940, pp. 40-49.

³ Bower, William Clayton, *The Curriculum of Religious Education*, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925, Chap. IV.

⁴ Cf. Elliott, *op. cit.*, esp. pp. 49-62.

International Council of Religious Education, in the late 1920's.⁵ That they did *affect* curriculum making, however, is evident to anyone familiar with the history of the American Sunday school curriculum.

THE NEW CLIMATE IN THE MID-TWENTIETH CENTURY

As has already been indicated, two aspects of the current rethinking of the Christian faith seriously challenge the Religious Education of the first half of the twentieth century. An additional force, outside the church, might also be discussed were there time: namely, the more recent developments in psychological thinking. These too raise serious questions concerning the adequacy of progressivism in education. We can concern ourselves here, however, only with the recent biblical and theological thinking as it affects Religious Education.

The basis for the new formulations of Christian theology is the Bible, hence the tendency is to take the message of the Bible more seriously than did liberal theology. There is no disposition to return to the precritical days, and the fundamentalists, at least from this point of view, are correct in judging the new theology as more in keeping with liberalism than with fundamentalism. Yet this interest in the *kerygma* of the New Testament as the permanent, relatively unchanging element, with the *didache* placed in a less important position, necessitates a rethinking of the place of the Bible in the curriculum of the church school. It can hardly be considered as merely a source book; it must again be interpreted as containing the record of God's revelation to man, the Living Word of God centering in Jesus Christ. We do not overlook the *teachings* of the New Testament, but it is the *proclamation* of the central message of God in Christ with which we must begin.

Not only in its attitude toward the Bible but also at other points does the new theology challenge Religious Education. As was indicated above, it is particularly in its insistence on man's participation in universal sinfulness that the conflict arises. There is no inclination in most theologians to return to an interpretation of original sin which makes its transmission equivalent to the inheriting of a particular color of eyes. Rather they emphasize the fact that all men participate in a condition involving partial perspective, finiteness, self-centeredness, and at its worst, pretensions at being something other than a finite human being.

Along with this is a recognition of the divine character of the Kingdom

⁵ Cf. Elliott, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-62. For a discussion of more recent changes, in the opposite direction, see William Clayton Bower, "Protestant Religious Education," *Religious Education*, XLVIII:291-390, September-October, 1953.

of God, and man's participation in that Kingdom not as an achiever of it but rather as a manifester of its character. Man is responsible before God for performing signs of the Kingdom, but he cannot himself achieve it: it is a gift of God. Theologians are not in agreement as to how the Kingdom comes as a gift, nor when it comes. At one point they *are* in agreement: it is not to be identified with a social utopia, as religious educators tended to do.⁶

It is not the purpose of this paper to argue for or against the new theological thinking. The fact of the matter is that it is here. Further, it seems probable that it meets the needs of our tragic era more adequately than does the thinking of a generation ago. Many people feel, with a great deal of evidence on their side, that it is much closer to the historic Christian faith than was liberal theology. Whether one agrees with the new thinking or not, it appears to be here to stay. It will no doubt undergo many restatements, and it is doubtful whether *the* theologian of the new Reformation has as yet arisen. Already, however, the dialogue of faith is between various exponents of the new thinking, rather than between it and the theology of a past generation.

The effect on Religious Education is obvious. The new thought raises serious questions concerning the educability of human nature. It causes the conception of Christian nurture to be re-examined. It necessitates a rethinking of the place of crisis and response in the developing religious life of the child. It demands serious consideration of the type of Christian teaching being done with children, lest that teaching be such a mild interpretation of the unconditional demands of the Gospel that it immunize them against responding later to its absolute demands. These and other questions call for careful consideration by religious educators.

Yet the tendency among many of those engaged professionally in Religious Education is to ignore the new theology. Others recognize it only as an enemy to be battled without compromise. There are still others who insist that only minor adjustments need be made in the teaching of the church to accommodate it to the new thinking. Perhaps a little more emphasis on the Bible and on Christian beliefs will be necessary, but nothing more. Still a fourth group, small in number perhaps, have rejected Religious Education completely. This is the tendency of the theologian, and is no more a creative solution to the problem than the rejection of the new theology.

⁶ For a brief summary of this new theological thought, see Daniel Day Williams, *What Present-Day Theologians Are Thinking*, Harper & Brothers, 1952.

There is another position, however, which appears to this writer to be a more realistic one: that is, to re-examine what we are doing in Christian teaching and to attempt to rethink it in the light of the new climate of thought.⁷ If religious educators are true to their basic principles, they will do this. They, of all persons, ought to be aware of the fact that life is dynamic; that what was once an innovation may become that against which we must revolt; that there is a continuous need for a re-evaluation and restatement of both theory and practice. Unfortunately many are reacting defensively rather than creatively. What is called for here is a willingness to modify the practices of Religious Education while not capitulating to those who would reject completely the values which it has enunciated.

TOWARD A SOLUTION

The situation which we face today, then, is one in which opposing schools of thought are in danger of not learning from each other. Those who accept the new theology may lose the values inherent in Religious Education, while religious educators, in becoming defensive and refusing to listen to the new theologians, could help to destroy that in which they believe. Theologians and religious educators ought to be able to learn from each other. The theologian is in danger of throwing out the baby with the bath; the religious educator is in danger of letting the bath water become stale. To put it another way, the danger of Religious Education is that it will come to foster a mere cultural religion, concerned with character education but not much interested in the over-againstness of the gospel. The danger of the new theology, if it does not seek the best possible means of communicating the gospel, is that it will make the gospel culturally irrelevant. Neither side can afford to ignore the insights of the other.

Let us illustrate this thesis by indicating certain values of Religious Education that the church can ill afford to lose. Perhaps the most important of these is the so-called "life-centered" approach to Christian teaching. It may well be that this principle has been abused, so that in some units of study for the church school there is little distinction between what is taught in them and what is taught in the public schools. Yet the importance of leading the young into good human relations should not be forgotten in the new theological context. The problem with life-centered teaching has not been that the gospel should not be made relevant to life,

⁷ The best statement along this line is Randolph C. Miller's *The Clue to Christian Education*, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951. Theodore O. Wedel's *Man's Need and God's Action*, The Seabury Press (Greenwich, Conn.), 1953, is also a contribution in this direction.

but rather that sometimes curriculum materials have not related life to the gospel. This problem becomes increasingly acute as our culture has less residual orientation toward the Christian faith. We can no longer take for granted a basic understanding of that faith.⁸

Actually most of the new theology is interested in keeping its teaching culturally relevant. Having been considerably influenced by existentialism, which has many and varied expressions, the new thought generally insists that truth is not an abstraction to be learned by rote but is something which must grip the person in terms of his own emptiness and lack of fulfillment. To return to a kind of transmissive education would appear to be out of harmony with what many theologians are saying today. Perhaps the term "life-centered" needs to be modified so that the *two* foci of teaching can be made clear: the Christian faith, and life as it is now being lived. There ought to be no conflict between "life-centered" and "Christ-centered" teaching when thought of in this manner.

It may well be that we need for the present to re-emphasize the content of the Christian faith in our teaching. Because of the general ignorance concerning the Bible, the history of the faith, and its meaningful expression in theology and ethics, we may need to place more importance on this phase of teaching. To think of this as the end and purpose of Christian teaching would be most unfortunate, however. Christian truth must be made existentially meaningful, and the "life-centered" approach of Religious Education ought not to be lost.

A second obvious contribution of modern Religious Education is an understanding and recognition of the differences in age groups. It is difficult for us to realize that the kind of carefully graded teaching material which we now take for granted is of recent origin. We need to continue to remember that it would be absurd to expect a kindergarten child to understand many of the theological formulations concerning Jesus Christ. To use a word like "atonement" with this age (as some fundamentalist publications do) seems unrealistic.

Yet there is need of much reconsideration of what exactly we can teach to children at different ages. In no phase of Christian theology is this more acute than in the thinking children do about Jesus Christ, the problem being what to teach the young child that he will not have to unlearn later. Is it sound, for example, to present Jesus to young children as a man who went about doing good and as nothing else? Is it possible

⁸ Cf. Read, David H. C., *The Communication of the Gospel*, London: S.C.M. Press, 1952, especially Chap. II.

on this foundation to lead the child step by step (even as Jesus' disciples apparently were led, according to the Synoptic gospels) until the adolescent can say with Thomas, "My Lord and my God"? Both theologian and educator ought to face such a question, *together*.

A third emphasis which illustrates the importance of our keeping calm as we reassess our educational tradition is on the importance of persons in the community of the church. Closely related to the first point suggested, this point of view is that persons do not exist for the sake of subject matter, but rather subject matter for the sake of persons. To put it another way, the gospel is not some irrelevant principle floating above the human scene, but rather it is concerned with and involved in the human scene, for the persons who constitute culture. The message of the New Testament is that God so loved the world of human persons that he gave himself through Jesus Christ that these persons might have eternal life.

Out of this concern has grown in educational practice the kind of teaching which takes into account individual differences and recognizes that transmission from teacher to pupil is not necessarily the most effective teaching. It would be unfortunate indeed if in the reconsideration of our educational practices we lost this insight, which, among other things, has led to an interest in a variety of teaching methods, materials, projects, and the like, in an attempt to meet the needs of the *individuals* who make up a group.

A fourth contribution which ought not to be lost, the emphasis on Christian nurture, is a question which elicits discussion and disagreement. Some theologians today are saying that to nurture a person in the Christian life is to inoculate him against the unconditional demands of the gospel and thus to make him unaware of the abyss which he faces in his finiteness, such a facing of the abyss being necessary to produce the crisis in which he responds to God through absolute obedience. This danger must not be denied. The history of Protestant sects illustrates the fact that a group of people who separate themselves from a conventional church express in a fresh and dynamic manner the meaning of the Christian faith for themselves. Further, it appears that as succeeding generations are born into the faith, they come more and more to take this particular expression for granted, and eventually the sect has become another conventional church, with its emphasis on the organic rather than the covenantal nature of the church.

Yet to ignore the importance of Christian nurture is to fail to accept one of the realities of our human existence: that children *are* nurtured

in *some* kind of faith in the various communities in which they live. It is no doubt true that the most enthusiastic disciple of Christ is a person who has come into the Christian Community through a deliberate decision, who having renounced the world and its ways enters into his new life with a high appreciation of what God's grace has done for him. The Apostle Paul faced a similar question in the letter to the Romans when he asked, "Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound?" His answer is a resounding "By no means!" (Romans 6:1-2, RSV.) Although he is speaking here in a different context, nevertheless his response is not totally unrelated to what we are likely to say in answer to the question, "Are children to be brought up in sin in order that they may face the abyss of their lives?"

Perhaps what we need is a restatement of this basic principle in the context of the word "community."⁹ Children are born into the community of the family, and they are nurtured there or in some substitute family. They are a part of other communities—play groups, public school classes, Sunday school groups. As they grow into adolescence and maturity, they become a part of many other communities. The influence of some of these groups is good, some bad. The fact of the matter is, however, that the response which the child and later the adult makes to life will be greatly influenced by these communities.

One of these communities, then, is the "Community of Faith." As F. W. Dillistone has so clearly pointed out,¹⁰ a child born into a church family is in one sense born into the Community of Faith, a fact symbolized in some churches by infant baptism, in others by infant dedication. Thus the church is in one sense organic. Yet in another sense the church must be thought of as an institution of the covenant, into which each individual for himself by conscious decision must enter. The example which he uses to illustrate this dual relationship is that of the family. Every person is born biologically as a member of a human family; yet he does not enter fully into that community unless the parents accept him and later he enters into a kind of family covenant, through which he accepts the restrictions, standards, and practices of the family. A child may reject his family even when he continues to live under the same roof.¹¹

This rather extended presentation of the point is made in order to indicate the importance of it. It is in this Community of Faith that nurture

⁹ Cf. Brunner, Emil, *The Divine Imperative*, The Westminster Press, 1947, Book III, for a discussion of these "orders" or communities in which people live.

¹⁰ Dillistone, F. W., *The Structure of the Divine Society*, The Westminster Press, 1951, Chap. 12.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 221-222.

must take place so that the child may himself enter into a covenant with God through Christ. Hence there seems to be no necessary disjunction between an emphasis on crisis and decision and on nurture, provided the two are held consciously in proper relationship.

There are other aspects of Religious Education which might be mentioned. Let us turn now, however, to illustrations of some of the contributions which the new theological climate can make to our practice of pedagogy in our churches, recognizing that this has already been touched on in other parts of the paper.

Perhaps the chief point of conflict has to do with the doctrine of man. It is probably true that a theology of complete despair over man would lead to a discontinuation of Christian teaching. One gets the impression that Kierkegaard would not make a very good churchman in twentieth-century America! Yet the new theology with some exceptions does not deny the worth of man provided that worth is seen as derivative from God. Further it does not minimize the possibility of man's responding to God in such a manner that he becomes a creative member of the Christian Community.

There is doubtless need for Religious Education to take more seriously the doctrine of sin expressed in contemporary theology. This does not mean that the methods of "child evangelism" need to be followed in an attempt to make children aware of their sinful nature. One step in the direction of self-acceptance with regard to our finiteness and sin is the realization which a child has of the need of *human* forgiveness. In the experiences of the home the child actually knows both judgment and forgiveness, and if the home is one in which Christian attitudes and practices are expressed, the foundation on which he can come to understand both his own nature and that of God is being laid.

It is true that it would be easy for such an emphasis to degenerate into the emotionalism of revivalism, and there is obviously need for re-thinking carefully how children and youth can be brought to the place where they see themselves as "sinners standing in the need of prayer." Precisely because we have not taken man's finiteness and self-centeredness seriously during the past half century, we find ourselves with inadequate techniques for encouraging real decision and surrender. Perhaps the return to more adequate expressions of worship, the emphasis on counseling, and the emergence of the small group as part of Protestantism point in the direction in which we need to move.

There is need, then, that we recognize that Christian growth is not

usually an orderly, uninterrupted process, but rather that it does involve major crises, decisions, times of surrender, and even set-backs. Psychology joins with theology in indicating this. Depth psychology in particular is clear in its teaching that "demons" from the unconscious may arise to plague us at unexpected times. Consequently, the concept of man in contemporary theology should cause Religious Education to rethink both the process and the techniques employed in the development of the religious life.

Two additional contributions of the new theology will illustrate further the importance of that discipline and Religious Education's coming to terms with one another. One of these concerns the renewed emphasis on the Bible as the Word of God, and consequently as deserving of a place of centrality in our teaching and preaching. There is no particular interest on the part of modern biblical theologians in a return to memorization of biblical precepts in order that the child may repeat a certain number of verses. Rather the interest is that the message of the Bible be taken seriously, and thus, as was pointed out previously, our curriculums may need to be modified in the light of this concern.

The other change which ought to be taken seriously pertains to the context in which Christian teaching is done. It is at this point that Randolph Miller's *The Clue to Christian Education* can be especially helpful. Such a context ought to present God not only as a loving Father but also as Judge; Jesus not only as a man who went about doing good but also as the Divine Savior; the Bible not only as a source book for Christian living but also as the carrier of the revelation which centers in Jesus Christ. How much change this will necessitate in method and approach remains to be seen. Perhaps Miller is right in thinking that the new context will not mean a radical change in the technique.¹² Perhaps there will need to be more changes than he believes, and hence practices will need to be modified as we go along. Whatever else is done, however, the two foci of our concern in dealing with persons must be kept—the "given" of the Christian faith, and the "given" of the human situation. With these two in mind, Christian teaching can be made both existentially meaningful and really Christian as it seeks to relate the two.

IN CONCLUSION

The suggestions made here are obviously only a beginning. An attempt has been made, however, to indicate that religious educators—be

¹² Miller, *op. cit.*, esp. Chap. I.

they seminary professors, national executives, directors in local churches, pastors, lay teachers, or what else—need to rethink both their basic assumptions and their methods in the light of the new theology of man and his relationship to God and to his fellow men. Instead of concentrating solely on the discovery of new and better techniques, religious educators need to re-examine *why* they are doing *what* they are doing, and *what* they are doing in the first place.

Religious educators must be willing to learn from theologians and Bible scholars. Conversely theologians and Bible scholars must be willing to learn from religious educators. Not until this happy wedding occurs will we be able to reconstruct our thinking in such a manner that we may effectively and creatively communicate the gospel in the complex world in which we live.

Theological Gamesmanship—II

With a Special Section, "Making the Best of Not Having Been to Evanston"

ROBERT McAFFEE BROWN

LIKE EVERY INFANT SCIENCE, Theological Gamesmanship¹ flourishes best when many minds, after pursuing independent research, correlate their findings. The present monograph attempts no more than a bringing together of the most significant discoveries in this field in the last twelve months.

New Okay Words, a revised list: Buber,² The interpreter's bible, The library of Christian classics (each one word), Kittel,³ *Heilsgeschichte*,⁴ Pusey,⁵ Lesslie Newbigin,⁶ Evanston.⁷

New Non-Okay Words: existentialism. It has become clear that this word is fraught with danger. Opponent can always retort, "Do you mean Christian existentialism, humanistic existentialism, atheistic existentialism, ontic or meontic existentialism?"⁸

The Duns Scotus Diversion. The most exciting example of Real-Life Theological Gamesmanship which I have observed in the last year took place recently in a discussion group which I was invited to attend, and deserves rather extended analysis.

About halfway through the evening, a student who had not taken very active part in a heated discussion intervened to comment, "Personally,

¹ Cf. "Theological Gamesmanship," *RELIGION IN LIFE*, Summer 1953, pp. 413-419. Attention should once again be directed to that progenitor of all types of Gamesmanship, Stephen Potter, Esq., whose three books on the subject (*Gamesmanship*, *Lifesmanship* and *One Up-Manship*, published by Henry Holt & Co.) should be on every Gamesman's shelf.

² Cf. the prediction in *ibid*, p. 414, that this would be the case.

³ Whenever the meaning of a biblical word is discussed, ask, with some eagerness, "Did you get that from Kittel?" Or, alternately, if you are unsure how to pronounce "Kittel," the same general effect can be obtained by asking of a given word, "What's its Aramaic equivalent?"

⁴ Appropriate whenever such a phrase as "the drama of the Old Testament" occurs in a conversation. Then, Self: (murmuring) "Ah yes, *Heilsgeschichte* . . ."

⁵ Of special interest to New England Gamesmen, and all those in the field of Religion in Higher Education and/or Theological Education.

⁶ Better written than spoken. Hard to inflect vocally so as to make clear that you know about that extra "s."

⁷ As in "Making the Best of Not Having Been to," cf. below, pp. 401-404.

⁸ Thanks here to the Rev. L. Shein, M.A., Ph.D., (Tor.), our most brilliant Gamesman north of the border.

ROBERT McAFFEE BROWN, Ph.D., is Auburn Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology and Philosophy at Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

(pause) I feel sure (pause) that the last word on this subject, (pause) philosophically speaking, that is, (pause) was enunciated by Duns Scotus (long pause) with his doctrine (pause) of *hecceity*.⁹ I was dazzled by the sheer daring of this manoeuver, but more dazzled still by the respectful silence which followed it.¹⁰ No one challenged the statement, or asked so much as a mild "How?" or "In what way?"

Analyzing this gambit, I think we can attribute its success to the four following factors:

1. The statement was delivered slowly (pause) and deliberately, (pause) and therefore (pause) authoritatively.
2. It was a statement which took considerable background to challenge.
3. It included a foreign word,¹¹ and an impressive one at that.
4. It included two important disclaimers: viz., (a) "Personally," and (b) "philosophically speaking, that is," making it possible in case of challenge for Gamesman to respond respectively with (a) "I'm not at all surprised that Gilson disagrees. This is merely my own theory, on the basis of a rather rough translation I made of the *Opus Oxoniense* last summer," and (b) "What you say may be very true, but isn't it a bit beside the point? I wasn't talking about Scotus' *theology*."

I went home and looked up the matter in question. (It took me about three hours.) Gamesman had hit the nail squarely on the head.¹²

Although there is no other conceivable situation in which this remark would be even remotely appropriate, it should be possible to adapt The Duns Scotus Diversion to dozens of worth-while uses, by the judicious adaptation of the four factors cited above.

Mastering the World of Books. Most of us face our gravest problem in trying to keep up with the new books. It is a fact, which too few people have had the courage to face squarely and honestly, that *no* one can keep pace with the new religious books which glut the market each month. And since it is becoming exceedingly commonplace¹³ to dismiss pointed questions about contemporary religious literature with the statement, "I never read a book until it has had at least five years¹⁴ to prove itself," some further devices are obviously called for, and are hereby offered.

I. Making use of foreign titles. Certain books achieve an international reputation before being translated into English. It is therefore impressive

⁹ I knew for a fact that no one else in the room had ever heard the word *hecceity*.

¹⁰ Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 417, "The Offhand Use of Foreign Words."

¹¹ In certain circles this fact would reduce the effectiveness of the gambit, but *in this particular case* I feel that the incidental fact that the statement was true does not materially detract from the brilliance of the manoeuver.

¹² What might be called a Non-Okay Manoeuver.

¹³ With people whom one sees frequently, the figure can be doubled or quadrupled.

to refer to them only by their foreign titles (usually German), as a way of suggesting that you were thoroughly familiar with them long before someone undertook the essentially vulgar task of translation. A list is appended:

Cullman, *Christus und die Zeit*

Spengler, *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*¹⁴

Barth, *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik*¹⁵

Schleiermacher: refer to "the *Glaubenslehre*"

Augustine, *de Civitate Dei* (never, for example, *The City of God*)

It is sometimes helpful to compare an original title with a translated title. Thus:

Gamesman: For me, the whole of theology is summarized in the title of Brunner's *Wahrheit als Begegnung*, truth as encounter.

Opponent: Oh, is that a new book of Brunner's?

Gamesman: Dear me, no! The English translation was called . . . let me see, *The Divine-Human Encounter*, or some such thing. Came out about ten years ago.

2. *Knowing the great writers by their obscure books.* Since it is usually too hard to master the mature writings of contemporary theologians, a safe way out of possible embarrassment is to become familiar with one early, and more easily digested, book by the man in question. Since this will probably be unknown to Opponent, the discussion can be shifted to ground with which Gamesman is thoroughly familiar. Thus:

Gamesman: Yes, certainly I've gone through *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, but actually, you know, the whole thesis is present in germinal form in *Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic*. You haven't read it? Why, there's existential writing at its best! Rather hard to come across these days, I'll admit, but I have a copy I might be able to loan you for a few days. I refer to it pretty constantly.

or,

Opponent: What did you think of Tillich's first volume?¹⁶

Gamesman: Oh, I know it's all the rage to be reading the *Systematic Theology* these days, but actually I've never been able to get over my enthusiasm for his little book on *The Religious Situation*. Absolutely basic for a true understanding of his position. I don't believe I'd understand Tillich at all if I hadn't given a summer to it back in '37. *What did you think of it?*

3. *The Masterful-Little-Volume Manoeuver.* It is often sufficient

¹⁴ For an unusual effect, give your own rather stumbling translation of this work, perhaps *The Decay of the Occident*. This will suggest that you have lived so long with your own German copy that you have never bothered to glance at an English translation, and may, in fact, even be unaware of the latter's existence.

¹⁵ It will become more and more important to use this title as successive volumes appear in English translation.

¹⁶ This will remain an acceptable "Okay Word" (cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 413-414) until superseded by a more up-to-date "Okay Word," viz.: "Tillich's second volume." When this change will occur is known only to Tillich, perhaps not even to him.

to appear enthusiastic about a book in such a way as to suggest that although you are far too charitable to say so outright, the book, to your way of thinking, isn't very substantial. All that is involved is referring to *a really first-class book* as a "masterful little volume." Example: "Have you seen Nygren's masterful little volume, *Agape and Eros*?"

While the adjective "masterful" sounds praiseworthy, it can be said in such a way as to imply an eager young author who has gone rather over his head, but whose head you are determined to pat for "a good try." To heighten the attitude of condescension, it is necessary to combine the adjective "masterful" with the adjective "little" (as in Example above). There is nothing so patronizing as the word "little," particularly when applied to a work which runs to over 700 pages, or has been put out in a two-volume edition.¹⁷ "While he was at it, why didn't the man, for goodness' sake, do a thorough job?" is the impression which will be conveyed.

Further devices for disposing of authors:

Of theologians who write too few books: "Isn't the man ever going to have the courage to put something in print? He must be mighty unsure of his position."

Of theologians who write too many books: "A man who turns 'em out that fast simply can't have time for really serious study."

This disposes of everybody.

Finally, to quote book titles in *slightly inaccurate* fashion can suggest that although you have read the book you couldn't quite be bothered getting the title firmly lodged in mind. Purely for clinical reasons, and with no attempt to cast disparagement on the book in question (which is admirable), I have given an example of this device in footnote 18.

"*Help from St. Augustine.*"¹⁸ A quiet yet forceful way of demonstrating superiority when Augustine is under discussion is to pronounce his name in contrary fashion to the pronunciation of Opponent. Make a point of *emphasizing* the contrast, so that it will be apparent that you know you are right, and that not even for politeness' sake will you pronounce the name incorrectly as Opponent is doing. Either,

Opponent: . . . leading idea in *Augustine*.¹⁹

Gamesman: *Augustine*²⁰ may have said that on one or two occasions, but . . .

¹⁷ The book in Example was first published in *three volumes*, and has recently been reprinted in an edition running to 764 pages.

¹⁸ For this phrase, used in an entirely different context, I am grateful to R. Shinn, *Christianity and the Meaning of History*, cf. esp. pp. ix, 29 et seq.

¹⁹ Ogg-us-teen.

²⁰ uh Guss'n.

or,

Opponent: (usually an Anglican in this case) . . . leading idea in *Augustine*.

Gamesman: *Augustine* *may* have said that on one or two occasions, but the whole *Augustinian* tradition, following, as I believe, the essential *Augustine* himself . . .

In this second gambit, it is advisable to manoeuvre the conversation into a discussion of "the Augustinian tradition" as indicated, so that when Opponent refers to it, as he must, *without* pronouncing it "the Augustinian tradition," you can smile deprecatingly, to indicate that your point has been made.²¹

Brazening It Out. Occasionally, Gamesman will be outmanoeuvred. It is well to be prepared for such occasions. I once wrote a friend apologizing for not mentioning his book in an article I had written, as a means of drawing his attention to the fact that the article had been accepted by a well-known religious quarterly. He replied, unkindly, in kind:

Opponent: I appreciate your calling my attention to the little article²² you did in *RELIGION IN LIFE*, as I might otherwise have missed the really superb piece by Butterfield. That alone was worth a year's subscription. Herb²³ hadn't told me he was working on this problem.

There was only one thing to do: Brazen It Out.

Self: (ignoring the slurring inference about own article and picking up on the only possible opening) Good heavens! Do you mean to say you didn't know Professor Butterfield²⁴ was working on that? Why, he and I spent a whole afternoon discussing it in the Senior Common Room at Mansfield, two—no, it must have been three—years ago. How glad I am you have finally stumbled across it.

²¹ With *sensitive* Anglicans, it will often be enough simply to raise (a) both eyebrows, and (b) the second, third, and fourth fingers of the left hand, ever so slightly.

²² An interesting adaptation of the Masterful-Little-Volume Manoeuvre, cf. above, p. 398f.

²³ Note use of the *Palsy-Walsy-With-The-Great* Technique, described in *op. cit.*, pp. 417-418.

²⁴ Note here the rejection, temporarily, of the *Palsy-Walsy-With-The-Great* Technique as a means of Putting Opponent in His Place, since it becomes obvious from the rest of the statement that Self knows the man in question well, and yet admires him far too much to apply to him the monosyllabic epithet, "Herb."

SPECIAL SECTION

MAKING THE BEST OF NOT HAVING BEEN TO EVANSTON

This summer several hundred of our fellow Americans will attend meetings of the World Council of Churches at Evanston, Illinois. It is inevitable that for the next couple of years they will occupy an enviable status, being looked upon as Experts, and Ones Who Will Be in Demand for Speeches. Interested little clusters of people will gather around them at conferences, synods, and church dinners. . . .

This will put the rest of us, Those who Weren't There, at a decided disadvantage. How can we (and this, perhaps, is the question of the hour) keep these few obnoxious people, with their "First-hand observations," their I-Was-There pontificating, and their inevitable Kodachrome slides ("See, that's the back of Bishop Berggrav's head") from dominating the scene indefinitely?

NOTE: It is unnecessary to give advice to delegates actually *going* to Evanston, since the question of how to behave at a Conference has been the subject of an exhaustive monograph by H. Smith, "Notes on Conferencemanship," *motive*, December, 1953, pp. 34-38.

To these suggestive comments, however, one more might perhaps be added. It will often be desirable at Evanston not to appear to be an American, since much of the rest of the theological world regards American churchmen as Shallow by definition. It is always possible to pass for a British Theologian (A Cut Above the American, by definition) by means of the following devices:

1. Keep your mouth shut. (Few Britishers sound as though they came from Kansas or western Pennsylvania.)
2. Drink tea at 4 P.M. every afternoon. If you are in a committee meeting at 4 and can't do this, either (a) leave, or (b) act restless.
3. Carry with you at all times, with its title showing, a paperback murder mystery, preferably *The Case of the Fan Dancer's Horse*.
4. Refuse on all occasions to wear an identification tag.

Device No. 3 can be relied upon, even if the others fail.

Months of research have shown that the following gambits are most likely to be effective.

1. *Giving the impression that you were there too.* With a certain amount of daring, it is possible, without actually lying, to create the impression that you were at Evanston too. Say casually, from time to time next fall, "When I was at Evanston . . ." and follow up (perhaps after a reminiscent pause) with such a remark as, "It occurred to me that the ecumenical movement was at last a reality—*really*, I mean." All that is necessary to lend the strictest verisimilitude to this statement is for you, sometime during the summer, to drive to "Evanston" and think the thought, perhaps

while the oil is being changed. For the convenience of Gamesmen, a list is here appended of the "Evanstons" in the United States:

Evanston, Wyoming
 Evanston, Indiana
 Evanston, Mississippi
 Evanston, Illinois²⁵
 Evanston, Pennsylvania.

The parish minister, for example, will find it well worth his while to detour fifty miles during his summer vacation, so that he can in all truth make some variant of the suggested statement at a meeting of the Women's Guild next October.²⁶

2. *Confining Oneself to Highly Generalized Remarks.* When asked to make a specific comment, next fall, about a part of the Evanston findings, or to talk on the implications of one of the section reports (which you haven't read), it is possible to pose as an Expert by making a very simple statement and then developing its ramifications at great length. Viz: "The most significant thing about Evanston is that it *occurred*."²⁷ Similar statements which may also be used, often within five minutes of each other, are:

- a. Ecumenical interchange is *always* significant, even if no conclusions are reached.
- b. I'm sure that the fact that things were *said*, and said openly, is far more important than *what* was said.
- c. Personally, I'm not worried by these supposed differences of opinion. After all, if we agreed about everything, it would be time for another Reformation.
- d. What a pity Barth wasn't there!

3. *The outright declaration of war.* "Was I at Evanston? Heavens no, I'm far to busy for that sort of thing."

4. *Making things uncomfortable for the person who was There.* All in all, the safest and surest line of attack. Simply play the part of the Outsider who Wants to Know What it Was Like. There are three suggested lines of approach.

First, *The Now-YOU-Tell-Us! Attack.* Thus:

Gamesman: (to another member of the group) I really can't answer that question. But look . . . (turning to fix Evanstonian with a steady and fright-

²⁵ For those who prefer to have their cake and eat it too.

²⁶ This technique, known also as Illegitimate Geographical Inference, is helpful in other situations. For years I have been able to create a slight stir by remarking apologetically, "In all the time I spent at Cambridge, I'm ashamed to say I never once heard C. H. Dodd lecture."

I have, as a matter of fact, spent an aggregate of several weeks of my life in Cambridge, Massachusetts, but as far as I know, C. H. Dodd, who lectured regularly in Cambridge, England, has never set foot there.

²⁷ In certain areas of the country, local *mores* may dictate that the italicized word be deleted and the italicized words "took place" be substituted. This is legitimate.

ening stare) *you* were at Evanston. Now YOU tell us! Just what, precisely, were the points of difference between the two factions in the group on The Responsible Society?²⁸

Evanstonian: Well, I . . . as a matter of fact, I didn't. . . . That is to say . . .

Gamesman: (warming up) Come, come now. Don't be bashful, man. We want to know!

Evanstonian: (stalling in a way that is already obvious) Uh, Section what-did-you-say?

Gamesman: (having carefully memorized this beforehand) Oh come, you know. The preparatory report, all we poor fellows had a chance to see, was on "The Responsible Society in a World Perspective." You *must* have read it. In *The Ecumenical Review* for October of '53. Come now, enlighten us!

Evanstonian: What was your question again?

The Now-YOU-Tell-Us! Attack is useful in a variety of situations. It consists, to be explicit, of giving the impression to all who are listening, that Opponent is an Expert, and then asking him a question which he simply cannot answer. This creates the impression that, actually, he's been vastly overrated.

The following statement, though it may soon become dated, is easily adapted to new situations: "Now YOU tell us! You're in a position to know these things. Just between the six of us, who's going to be Harvard's new Dean?" Opponent's fumbling answer will make it clear that he is not On the Inside Track any more than you are. When he has finally been pressed into hazarding a guess, remark, "Oh, but I know for a fact that his name was dropped three months ago. Said he wasn't interested." (This may even be true.)

Second, *The Dashed-Hopes Decoy*. A bit more subtle. Thus:

Gamesman: Was t' Hooft pretty much in evidence during the meetings of Section Two?

Evanstonian: (caught off base) Well, I don't quite know . . . (he is getting ready to say, "You see, I wasn't in that section," when . . .)

Gamesman: (interrupting quickly, smoothly and innocently) Oh I say, I *beg* your pardon. I'd been under the impression that you were out at Evanston yourself. . . . Sorry.

Evanstonian: I was, but . . .

Gamesman: (softly, but with a shade of concern in his voice) Oh! (turns disappointedly away)

In three simple moves, Gamesman has managed to make Evanstonian feel that he was not only unobservant but even negligent in his observations. At least, the suspicion has been dimly planted in his mind.

²⁸ If possible, choose one of the sections whose meetings you know Evanstonian did not attend.

Third, *The Examination of Evanstonian's Eschatological Erudition.* Sure fire. Thus:

Gamesman: Look now, set us straight, will you? I know you spent a whole week at Evanston, talking about nothing but eschatology. What, precisely,²⁹ is the argument about?

Evanstonian: Well, it's pretty complicated . . .

Gamesman: Yes, yes, I know, but precisely what was the difference between the Europeans and the Americans?

Evanstonian: You mean . . .

Gamesman: (maintaining the initiative) Yes. Exactly. Was the discussion centered on the concept of *futuristic eschatology* . . .

Evanstonian: The first couple of days . . .

Gamesman: (just the least bit annoyed at having been interrupted) . . . or did it deal chiefly with *realized eschatology*? What I want to know, and what we *all* want to know, is, just precisely *how* was the term defined?

Evanstonian: (girding his loins for a shaky answer) Well . . .

Gamesman: (pressing his advantage) Don't you agree that that's the first thing we've got to get clear on?

Evanstonian: I'm not sure I follow you.

Gamesman: (genially to the group which has gathered) Well, I guess if the delegates didn't get it all ironed out, the rest of us poor chaps don't need to worry too much. (To someone else in group) You'd think, though, wouldn't you, that they'd have made a point to speak definitively on the theme of the conference?

Since Evanston undoubtedly *will* speak definitively, perhaps too definitively, the last remark will be interpreted not as a slam at Evanston, but only as a faint suggestion that Evanstonian somehow found things completely over his head.

In order to make the above devices absolutely foolproof—and this can be our final word—all that needs to be done by way of prior research is to look over the Evanston agenda, and then ask about something which took place on the only afternoon of the entire week when Evanstonian went out to Wrigley Field to watch the Chicago Cubs.

²⁹ Frequent use of the word "precisely" in asking about eschatology will be more unnerving to Evanstonian than any other aspect of the questioning he will face after he returns home. Never forget this fact.

Martin Buber at Seventy-five

MAURICE S. FRIEDMAN

I. BUBER AND AMERICA

ALTHOUGH IT IS ONLY in the last seven years that translations of Martin Buber's works have been published in the United States, more than thirteen American editions of his books have appeared in that time in addition to the active distribution by American publishers of *I and Thou* and a number of other works published in the British Isles. Buber himself came to the United States at the age of seventy-three, and spent from November 1951 to May 1952 teaching and lecturing throughout the country. In these lectures and in smaller gatherings, Americans discovered the prophetic force of Buber's personality and the tremendous strength and sincerity of his religious conviction. Everywhere he spoke, the arresting man with the white beard and the penetrating yet gentle eyes showed those present the meaning of true dialogue—what it means to ask "real questions" and to give real answers. As a result of this tour many more Americans now want to read and understand Buber's works.

For the more scholarly, books like *Between Man and Man*, *Paths in Utopia*, *The Prophetic Faith*, *Two Types of Faith*, *Israel and Palestine*, *Images of Good and Evil*, and *Eclipse of God* spell out the implication of Buber's I-Thou philosophy for personal relationships, community and social life, biblical religion, Zionism, and modern thought. Many of Buber's other works appeal to a broader audience, particularly his wonderful little book *The Way of Man*, but also *Hasidism*, the two volumes of the *Tales of the Hasidim*, *Ten Rungs* (Hasidic aphorisms), his Hasidic chronicle-novel *For the Sake of Heaven, Right and Wrong, Israel and the World*, and two works which are now in the process of translation, *The Legends of the Baal-Shem* and *Pointing the Way* (collected essays from 1910 to the present):¹

II. THE NARROW RIDGE

"I have occasionally described my standpoint to my friends as the

¹ A fuller listing of these works appears at the conclusion of this article.

MAURICE S. FRIEDMAN, M.A., Ph.D., is Professor of Philosophy and Literature at Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, New York. His forthcoming book, *Martin Buber: The Philosophy of the "Narrow Ridge,"* will be published toward the end of 1954 by the University of Chicago Press, and by Routledge & Kegan Paul in London.

'narrow ridge,'" writes Buber. "I wanted by this to express that I did not rest on the broad upland of a system that includes a series of sure statements about the absolute, but on a narrow rocky ridge between the gulfs where there is no sureness of expressible knowledge but the certainty of meeting what remains, undisclosed."²

Perhaps no other phrase so aptly characterizes the quality and significance of Martin Buber's life and thought as this one of the "narrow ridge." It expresses not only the "holy insecurity" of his existentialist philosophy but also the "I-Thou," or dialogical, philosophy which he has formulated as a genuine third alternative to the insistent either-ors of our age. Buber's "narrow ridge" is no "happy middle" which ignores the reality of paradox and contradiction in order to escape from the suffering they produce. It is rather a paradoxical unity of what one usually understands only as alternatives—I and Thou, love and justice, dependence and freedom, the love of God and the fear of God, passion and direction, good and evil, unity and duality. "The unity of the contraries," writes Buber, "is the mystery at the innermost core of the dialogue."

In all of Buber's works we find a spiritual tension and seriousness coupled with a breadth of scope which seeks constantly to relate this intensity to life itself and does not tolerate its limitation to any one field of thought or to thought cut off from life. More remarkable still, Buber has accomplished the rare feat of combining this breadth and intensity into an integral unity of life and thought, and he has done this without sacrificing the concrete complexity and paradoxicality of existence as he sees it. His writings are remarkable for their scope and variety, dealing with topics in the fields of religion, mythology, philosophy, sociology and social philosophy, politics, education, psychology, art, and literature. Despite this variety, Buber's philosophy attains a central unity which pervades all of his mature works.

Buber's thought has had a tremendous influence on a large number of prominent writers and thinkers in many different fields, and it seems destined to have a steadily greater influence as its implications become clearer. His influence as a person, what is more, has been almost as great as the influence of his thought. It is just this integral combination of greatness as a person and as a thinker which makes Buber one of the rare personalities of our time. The characteristic of both Buber's personality and his work, according to the German educator Karl Wilker, is "the greatest conceivable consciousness of responsibility."

² *Between Man and Man*, "What Is Man?" p. 184. I have taken this phrase as the subtitle of my forthcoming book on Buber, the first systematic and comprehensive study of Buber's thought.

The more I have come to know him, not only through his works but also face to face, the more strongly I have felt that his whole personality tolerates no untruthfulness and no unclarity. There is something there that forces one to trace out the last ground of things. . . . He who is thus must have experienced life's deepest essence. . . . He must have lived and suffered . . . and he must have shared with us all our life and suffering. He must have stood his ground face to face with despair. Martin Buber belongs to the most powerful renewal not only of a people but of mankind.³

The German Catholic thinkers Eugene Kagon and Karl Thieme speak of Buber in a similar fashion: "In everything that he writes the undertone reveals that here speaks a man of faith, and, indeed, a man of active faith." The most astonishing thing that one can say of Buber, they add, is that his person does not give the lie to his works.⁴ One who has met Buber knows that he is marked above all by simplicity, humor, seriousness, genuine listening, and an unwavering insistence on the concrete. One of the most striking testimonies to Buber as a whole man is that of Hermann Hesse, the famous Swiss novelist and poet:

Martin Buber is in my judgment not only one of the few wise men who live on the earth at the present time, he is also a writer of a very high order, and, more than that, he has enriched world literature with a genuine treasure as has no other living author—the tales of the Hasidim. . . . Martin Buber . . . is the worthiest spiritual representative of Israel, the people that has had to suffer the most of all people in our times.⁵

III. BUBER'S LIFE

Martin Buber was born in Vienna in 1878 and was brought up until the age of fourteen in the Galician home of his grandfather, Solomon Buber, one of the last great scholars of the *Haskala* (Jewish enlightenment). He studied philosophy and the history of art at the University of Vienna and the University of Berlin, and in 1904 he received his Ph.D. from the latter university. In his twenties he was the leader of those Zionists who advocated a Jewish cultural renaissance as opposed to purely political Zionism. In 1902 Buber helped found the *Jüdischer Verlag*, a German-Jewish publishing house, and in 1916 he founded *Der Jude*, a periodical which he edited until 1924 and which became under his guidance the leading organ of German-speaking Jewry. From 1926 to 1930 he published, jointly with the Catholic theologian Joseph Wittig and the Protestant doctor and psychotherapist Viktor von Weizsäcker, the peri-

³ Wilker, Karl, "Martin Buber," *Neue Wege*, Zurich, XVII, No. 4 (April 1923), 183f., my translation.

⁴ Kagon, Eugene, and Thieme, Karl, "Martin Buber," *Frankfurter Hefte*, VI, 3 (March, 1951), pp. 195-199.

⁵ From a letter of Hesse to a friend explaining his nomination of Buber in 1949 for a Nobel Prize in literature. Hermann Hesse, *Briefe*, Vol. VIII of *Gesammelte Werke* (Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1951), p. 324ff., my translation.

odical *Die Kreatur*, devoted to social and pedagogical problems connected with religion. From 1923 to 1933 Buber taught Jewish philosophy of religion and later the history of religions at the University of Frankfurt.

In 1938 Buber left Germany to make his home in Palestine, and from that year through 1951 he served as professor of social philosophy at Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Now that he is emeritus, the government of the state of Israel has asked him to double the size of the Institute for Adult Education that he founded in 1949 and has directed since. This Institute trains teachers to go out to the immigration camps to help integrate the vast influx of immigrants into the already established community.

IV. BUBER AND JUDAISM

Since the death of Hermann Cohen, Buber has been generally acknowledged as the representative figure of Western European Jewry. He wielded a tremendous influence not only upon the youth won over to Zionism but also upon the Liberals and even, despite his nonadherence to the Jewish law, upon the Orthodox. "It was Buber," writes Alfred Werner, "to whom I (like thousands of Central European men and women devoid of any Jewish background) owe my initiation into the realm of Jewish culture."⁶ Today in the third generation of his writing, speaking, and teaching, Buber is without question the representative figure of world Jewry as well. The steady spread of his influence from Europe to England and from Israel to America makes it clear that this is no temporary phenomenon but a deep-seated force in the life and destiny of the Jewish people.

Apart from his dialogical, or "I-Thou," philosophy, Buber is best known for his presentation and interpretation of Hasidism, the popular mystical movement that swept East European Jewry in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. According to Robert Weltsch, "Buber's discovery of Hasidism was epochal for the West: Buber made his thesis believable that no renewal of Judaism would be possible which did not bear in itself elements of Hasidism."⁷ In his earlier writings Buber regarded Hasidism as the real, though subterranean Judaism, as opposed to official Rabbinism which was only the outer husk. He has since come to feel that in Hasidism the essence of Jewish faith and religiousness was visible in the structure of the community, but that this essence has also been present "in a less con-

⁶ Rosenzweig, Franz, "Martin Buber," *Jüdisches Lexikon* (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1927), Vol. I, p. 1190f.; Werner, Alfred, "Buber at Seventy," *Congress Weekly*, Vol. XV (February 13, 1948), p. 10.

⁷ *Jüdisches Lexikon*, I, 1191, my translation.

densed form everywhere in Judaism," in the "inaccessible structure of the personal life."⁸

Buber characterizes this essence as "the hallowing of the everyday" and "the sanctification of the profane." This sanctification is carried out not only in the life of the individual but in that of the community as a whole, and it is just in this latter sphere—the undertaking to bring every area of community life under the kingship of God—that Buber finds the essence of biblical Judaism. In his translation of the Hebrew Bible into German along with Franz Rosenzweig, and in his remarkable works of biblical interpretation, Buber has pointed out that it is not monotheism but the dialogue between God and man which is the essence of biblical Judaism, and he has found in this biblical dialogue a powerful base for his own "I-Thou" philosophy.⁹

Although Buber gave up active leadership in the Zionist movement in favor of his broader religious, philosophical, and social interests, he has continued through his speeches and writings to exert an important influence on the Zionist movement and has renewed the prophetic demand that Israel build a community of righteousness and peace through just means that are consistent with this end. Buber's attitude toward Zionism is integrally related to his conviction that in the work of redemption Israel is called on to play the special part of beginning the kingdom of God through itself becoming a holy people. This election is not an occasion for particularist pride but a commission which must be carried out in all humility. It is not to be understood as an objective fact or a subjective feeling but as an uncompleted dialogical reality, the awareness of an address from God. In it the biblical covenant to make real the kingship of God through partnership with the land is combined with the Deutero-Isaianic concept of the "servant" under whose leadership Israel will initiate God's kingdom.¹⁰

Israel's special vocation is not just another nationalism which makes the nation an end in itself. The people need the land and freedom to organize their own life in order to realize the goal of community. But

⁸ *Israel and the World*, "The Faith of Judaism," p. 13.

⁹ *Die Schrift*, the Buber-Rosenzweig translation of the Bible, was published by Schocken Verlag, Berlin, in 14 volumes. A revised edition will be issued in 1954 by Jakob Hegner Verlag, Köln and Olten, with the five books of Moses appearing in one volume. For Buber's biblical interpretation see Buber, *The Prophetic Faith, Two Types of Faith, Good and Evil, Israel and the World*, Section II, *Israel and Palestine*, Part I. See also my articles, "Martin Buber's View of Biblical Faith," *The Journal of Bible and Religion*, Vol. XXII, No. 1 (January, 1954), and "Symbol, Myth, and History in the Thought of Martin Buber," *The Journal of Religion*, January, 1954.

¹⁰ *Israel and Palestine*, pp. 34f., 49f., 54; *The Prophetic Faith*, p. 232ff.

the state as such is at best only a means to the goal of Zion, and it may even be an obstacle to it if the true nature of Zion as commission and task is not held uppermost. Zionism must combine the political, the intellectual, and the religious levels if a rebirth of the Jewish people is to take place.¹¹

This means that true Jewish existence cannot be realized without a special relation to the land nor a true relation to the land without the goal of righteous community. "Zion means a destiny of mutual perfecting. It is not a calculation but a command; not an idea but a hidden figure waiting to be revealed. Israel would lose its own self if it replaced Palestine by another land, and it would lose its own self if it replaced Zion by Palestine."¹² If Israel reduces Zionism to "a Jewish community in Palestine" or tries to build a small nation just like other small nations, it will end by attaining neither.¹³

V. THE PHILOSOPHY OF DIALOGUE

Beginning the more than half a century of his published writings with a predominantly mystical emphasis, Buber went on to develop a philosophy of "realization"—realizing religious truth in the concrete reality of life. Decades before Berdyaev, Heidegger, Jaspers, and Sartre, Buber worked through to a mature existentialist philosophy, and decades before Barth, Brunner, Tillich, and the "crisis theologians" he saw the tremendous significance of Kierkegaard's thought for the theology of our time. Buber carried this existentialism a step further, moreover, to develop his dialogical, or "I-Thou," philosophy. This philosophy has had a widespread influence on thinkers of all faiths in Europe and America, among whom are Emil Brunner, Karl Barth, Paul Tillich, Hermann von Keyserling, Ernst Michel, Theodore von Steinbüchel, Hans Trüb, Ludwig Binswanger, Franz Rosenzweig, Hans Kohn, Felix Weltsch, Max Brod, Karl Heim, Friedrich Gogarten, Erich Przywara, S.J., Nicholas Berdyaev, Reinhold Niebuhr, H. Richard Niebuhr, and J. H. Oldham.¹⁴ Buber has himself explored the implications for such fields as religion, ethics, education, philosophical anthropology, social structure, art, and biblical criticism and interpretation.¹⁵

¹¹ *Israel and the World*, "On National Education," p. 159.

¹² *Israel and Palestine*, p. 142.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 144f.

¹⁴ For an evaluation of Buber's significance for Christianity see my article, "Martin Buber and Christian Thought," *The Review of Religion*, Vol. XVIII, Nos. 1-2 (November 1953), pp. 31-43.

¹⁵ In *Martin Buber* I have devoted a chapter apiece to the evaluation of the significance of each of these aspects of Buber's thought except art.

The classical expression of the dialogical philosophy is Buber's little book *I and Thou*. Man's two primary attitudes, according to this book, are "I-Thou" and "I-It." Man's "I" comes into being as he says "Thou," and it develops as he says one or the other of these two primary words. What is important in these attitudes is not the object over against one, but the way in which one relates to that object. I-Thou is the primary word of relation. It is characterized by mutuality, directness, presentness, intensity, and ineffability. Although it is only within this relation that personality and the personal really exist, the Thou of I-Thou is not limited to men but may include animals, trees, objects of nature, and God.

I-It is the primary word of experiencing and using. It takes place within a man, and not between him and the world. Hence it is entirely subjective and lacking in mutuality. Whether in knowing, feeling, or acting, it is the typical subject-object relationship. It is always mediate and indirect and hence is comprehensible and orderable, significant only in connection and not in itself. The Thou must continually become It, writes Buber, and the It may again become a Thou, but the It need not become a Thou at all. Man can live continuously and securely in the world of It; but if he only lives in this world he is not a man.¹⁶

The two aspects of the I-Thou philosophy to which Buber has given most emphasis are the dialogue between man and man and the dialogue between man and God. Genuine human dialogue, according to Buber, can be either spoken or silent. Its essence lies in the fact that "each of the participants really has in mind the other or others in their present and particular being and turns to them with the intention of establishing a living mutual relation between himself and them." The essential element of genuine dialogue, therefore, is "seeing the other," or "experiencing the other side." To meet the "other," one must be concerned with him as someone truly different from oneself, but at the same time as someone with whom one can enter into relation. "Experiencing the other side" means to feel an event from the side of the person one meets as well as from one's own side.

It is this action of "seeing the other" that Buber believes to be the essence of genuine ethical responsibility, in which one's response is not to subjective interest nor to an objective moral code but to the person one meets. It is also the essence of friendship and love, in which each member of the relationship is made present by the other in his concrete wholeness.

¹⁶ *I and Thou*, translated by Ronald Gregor Smith, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937, pp. 3, 5, 17f.

In teaching and in psychotherapy this "seeing the other" is necessarily a concrete but one-sided act of inclusion, since the pupil cannot be expected to see through the eyes of the teacher nor the patient through the eyes of the therapist without destroying the relationship.¹⁷

In Buber's philosophical anthropology, the aspect of his thought which has been of greatest concern to him in recent years, he has shown this act of "making the other present" to be the essential action of human existence, whereby individuals confirm one another in their concrete individuality as that which they are and that which they are capable of becoming. An animal cannot see its companions apart from their common life, nor ascribe to the enemy any existence beyond his hostility. Man sets man at a distance and makes him independent. He is therefore able to enter into relation, in his own individual status, with those like himself.

The basis of man's life with man is twofold, and it is one—the wish of every man to be confirmed as what he is, even as what he can become, by men; and the innate capacity in man to confirm his fellowmen in this way. That this capacity lies so immeasurably fallow constitutes the real weakness and questionableness of the human race: actual humanity exists only where this capacity unfolds. On the other hand, of course, an empty claim for confirmation, without devotion for being and becoming, again and again mars the truth of the life between man and man.¹⁸

This mutual confirmation of men is most fully realized in what Buber calls "making present," an event which happens partially wherever men come together but in its essential structure only rarely. Making the other present means to "imagine" the real, to imagine quite concretely what another man is wishing, feeling, perceiving, and thinking. It is through this making present that we grasp another as a self, that is, as a being whose distance from me cannot be separated from my distance from him and whose particular experience I can make present. This event is not complete until he knows himself made present by me and until this knowledge induces the process of his inmost self-becoming. "For the inmost growth of the self is not accomplished, as people like to suppose to-day, in man's relation to himself, but . . . in the making present of another self and in the knowledge that one is made present in his own self by the other."¹⁹

VI. THE ETERNAL THOU

J. H. Oldham, a leader of the ecumenical movement of the Christian church, has pointed to Buber's dialogical philosophy as the necessary,

¹⁷ For Buber's philosophy of education see *Between Man and Man*, "Education" and "The Education of Character." For his attitude toward psychotherapy see *The Way of Man*, p. 29f., *Hasidism*, pp. 54f., 87f.

¹⁸ Buber, Martin, "Distance and Relation," translated by Ronald Gregor Smith, *The Hibbert Journal*, January, 1951, Vol. XLIX, p. 110f.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 112f.

saving corrective of the dominance of our age by the scientific way of thinking and the technical mastery of things which threaten us with de-humanization and universal destruction. Speaking of *I and Thou* Oldham writes, "I question whether any book has been published in the present century the message of which, if it were understood and heeded, would have such far-reaching consequences for the life of our time."²⁰ Oldham's evaluation of *I and Thou* has been echoed by many other prominent theologians. Herbert Farmer writes of the religious aspects of Buber's "I-Thou" philosophy: "I regard this as the most important contribution that has been given to us of recent years toward the reflective grasp of our faith. It has already entered deeply into the theological thought of our time, and is, I believe, destined to enter still more deeply."²¹

In *I and Thou* Buber speaks of God as "the eternal Thou" who cannot become an "It." Men lose sight of God when they insist, in their philosophies and theologies, on turning him into an object among objects that can be defined and discussed. God is the Being lastingly over against us who can be addressed and not expressed, says Buber. He is the Absolute Person who, if he is not a person in his nature, has nevertheless become a person in order to know and be known, to love and be loved by man. This God cannot be reached by turning away from the world, for he is met in the encounter with every temporal Thou. Man becomes aware of the address of God in everything that meets him if he remains open to that address and ready to respond with his whole being.

Buber's religious philosophy lends itself remarkably well to Christian reinterpretation, as any reader of the many books Christianizing the I-Thou philosophy can attest. One of the most significant of these reinterpretations is J. E. Fison's use of Buber's philosophy of dialogue as the central element in his plea for a greater emphasis on the blessing of the Holy Spirit. The insights of Buber must be used, he says, "to show that the uniqueness of the Christian faith lies in that eternally reciprocal relationship of meeting between man and God and between man and man, which in time is symbolized and manifested by the crucifixion of the Son of God." Fison relies heavily on Buber's biblical interpretations as well as on *I and Thou*, and he recognizes that Buber has found a real basis for his I-Thou philosophy in the Hebrew Bible:

The Bible is the record and the transcript of actual human contact and encounter with the living God or it is nothing at all. Revelation is the key-word and that

²⁰ Oldham, J. H., "Life as Dialogue," *The Christian News-Letter*, Supplement to No. 281 (March 19, 1947), p. 7f.; Oldham, *Real Life Is Meeting*, The Macmillan Company, 1947, pp. 13-16.

²¹ Farmer, Herbert H., *The Servant of the Word*, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942, p. 25f.

revelation is personal and not propositional, even though it can only be transcribed in propositional terms. . . . No one in our day has spoken on this issue with such prophetic power as Martin Buber.

Fison indicates that Buber's work has aroused a controversy between the doctrine that real life is meeting and the doctrine that real life is being, and he asserts that evangelical Christianity stands emphatically for the former.²²

VII. THE REDEMPTION OF EVIL

One of the central and most repeated emphases in Buber's thought is his protest against the dualism which divides human existence into a "life in the spirit" and a "life in the world," or into "essential" relations with God and "inessential" relations with man. I-It is not simply evil nor is I-Thou simply good. The It must be penetrated by the Thou, the "evil urge" redirected and the everyday sanctified, if the kingdom of God is to become a reality. Redemption for Buber is not redemption *from* evil but redemption *of* evil as the power which God has given us to do his will, the power which only needs direction to become an essential element in the realization of God's kingdom.

Buber's belief in the redemption of evil does not mean any optimistic overlooking of the tragedy inherent in human existence. Buber includes tragedy within the redemption of evil, and it is just this which marks his deepest realism. Tragedy for him is the conflict between two men through the fact that each of them is as he is. This concept of tragedy is not an alternative to a religious view of life but an integral part of it. The Yehudi in Buber's chronicle-novel, *Moses*, the prophets, the "suffering servant of the Lord," and Jesus are to be understood in the light of this fact that men "are as they are." Tragedy is not simply an event that should be removed, but in its deepest meaning an integral part of life. "We cannot leave the soil of tragedy," Buber has said, "but in real meeting we can reach the soil of salvation after the tragedy has been completed."

Another consequence of Buber's realism has been his consistent opposition to the apocalypticism that looks for some one event in time which will usher in redemption. "God's redeeming power is at work everywhere and at all times, but . . . a state of redemption exists nowhere and never." The Jew experiences the world's lack of redemption perhaps more intensely than any other group, writes Buber. He feels it against his skin, tastes it on his tongue. "He always discovers only that mysterious intimacy of light out of darkness which is at work everywhere and at all times; no redemp-

²² Fison, J. E., *The Blessing of the Holy Spirit*, Longmans, Green & Co., 1950, pp. 28, 37f., 65, 127.

tion which is different in kind, none which by its nature would be unique, which would be conclusive for future ages, and which had but to be consummated.”²³

At the same time the Jew resists the radical division of the soul and the world which splits existing beings into the blessed and the damned. The real distinction does not lie, as Berdyaev thinks, between a naïve acceptance of the world and the experiencing of its tragedy, but between a Gnostic affirmation of a contradiction that cuts the world off from God and the Jewish belief that “tragedy” can be experienced in the dialogical situation.

What saved Judaism is not, as the Marcionites imagine, the fact that it failed to experience “the tragedy,” the contradiction in the world’s process, deeply enough; but rather that it experienced the *contradiction as theophany*. This very world, this very contradiction, unabridged, unmitigated, unsmoothed, unsimplified, unreduced, this world shall be—not overcome—but consummated.²⁴

VIII. THE GERMAN PEACE PRIZE

On September 27, 1953, in historic Paulskirche, Frankfurt, Germany, Buber was awarded the Peace Prize of the German publishers and book-sellers. In 1951 the recipient of the Peace Prize was Albert Schweitzer, a Protestant. In 1952 it was Romano Guardini, a Catholic. The fact that the prize in 1953 was given to a Jew is of especial significance in the light of the Nazis’ recent destruction of six million Jews “in a systematically prepared and executed procedure, the organized cruelty of which,” writes Buber, “cannot be compared with any earlier historical event.”

It is equally significant that Buber should accept such a prize, for he himself led the Jewish people in their spiritual battle against Nazism and he counts himself among “those who have not got over what happened and will not get over it.” Buber believes, however, that there is a solidarity across fronts of the forces of humanity against the forces of antihumanity which is the highest duty on earth in the present hour. “To obey this duty is laid on me,” he writes, “even there, indeed just there where the never-to-be-effaced memory of that which has happened stands in opposition to it.”²⁵

The highest significance of the award of the Peace Prize to Buber and of his acceptance of it lies in the recognition that the present world

²³ *Israel and the World*, “The Two Foci of the Jewish Soul,” p. 34f.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, “The Faith of Judaism,” p. 26.

²⁵ From “Genuine Conversation and the Possibilities of Peace,” the as-yet-unpublished speech of Buber on the occasion of receiving the Peace Prize; my translation.

crisis has its roots in a crisis of trust which can only be overcome by the resumption of genuine dialogue between men of different groups who will to understand the "other" in his true otherness. The modern world, writes Buber, is divided into hostile camps which are no longer able to communicate with one another. This failure in communication is caused by an existential mistrust which includes not only what the other side has to say but the very existence of the other. The only hope for this hour is the resumption of genuine dialogue between men.

For this to take place, men must come together from out of the camps and from behind the political structures. The true spiritual representatives of the peoples must meet with one another to distinguish between the real and the exaggerated needs of each people. There is one front of such men, writes Buber, the representatives of a true humanity who fight together even without knowing it, each in his own place. Only through this genuine conversation "in which each of the partners, even when he stand in opposition to the other, attends to, affirms, and confirms him as this existing other, . . . can the opposition, certainly not be removed from the world, but be humanly arbitrated and led toward its overcoming."²⁶

IX. PRESENT AND FUTURE

Now over seventy-five years old, Buber is honored the world over for his work as religious philosopher, Hasidic interpreter, biblical scholar, and social thinker. Even were he not to write another word, his influence would certainly continue to grow and spread in the decades to come. But his productivity has by no means come to an end. In addition to *Hinweise* and *Einsichten*, the latest of his new books to be published in Europe, he has just completed a short, but important essay on "The Elements of the Dialogical" ("Die Elemente des Zwischenmenschlichen") which he himself speaks of as the fourth and last of his principal essays on the life of dialogue.²⁷

More concrete and explicit than any of the three earlier works, this work owes much to the development of his philosophical anthropology. This anthropology has also played a principal role in the most recent and in some respects most important stage in the development of Buber's attitude

²⁶ "Genuine Conversation and the Possibilities of Peace"; "Hope for This Hour," translated by Maurice S. Friedman, *World Review*, December, 1952. "Hope for This Hour" is the address that Buber gave at the celebration in his honor at Carnegie Hall, New York City, April 4, 1952.

²⁷ "Die Elemente des Zwischenmenschlichen" was published in February, 1954, in *Merkur* (Berlin) and *Neue Schweizer Rundschau* (Zurich). The other three works to which Buber refers are *I and Thou*, "Dialogue," and "The Question to the Single One," the last two of which appear in *Between Man and Man*.

toward evil—that which recognizes a qualitative distinction between the more usual evil of indecision and a “radical evil” of absolute self-affirmation which follows it. Through his anthropology also he is making more explicit the implications of his I-Thou philosophy for the way in which we know.²⁸ It is here, in the concern for the problem of man, that we must look for the most significant future developments in Buber's thought.

WORKS OF MARTIN BUBER

Between Man and Man, London: Kegan Paul, 1947.

Paths in Utopia, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949. (Both distributed in this country by The Macmillan Company.)

The Prophetic Faith, The Macmillan Company, 1949.

Two Types of Faith, The Macmillan Company, 1952. (A study of Jesus and Paul.)

Images of Good and Evil, and Right and Wrong (an existential interpretation of six psalms), published separately in England but together in America, as:

Good and Evil: Two Interpretations, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.

The Way of Man; According to the Teaching of the Hasidim, Wilcox & Follett, 1951.

Hasidism, The Philosophical Library, 1948.

Eclipse of God: Studies in the Relation Between Religion and Philosophy, Harper & Brothers, 1952.

For the Sake of Heaven, 2nd Ed., Harper & Brothers, 1953.

Tales of the Hasidim, Vols. I and II, Schocken Books, 1947, 1948.

Ten Rungs, Hasidic Aphorisms, Schocken Books, 1947.

Israel and the World, Schocken Books, 1949.

Israel and Palestine, Farrar, Straus & Young, 1952.

The Legends of the Baal-Shem, translated by M. S. Friedman, to be published by Harper & Brothers in 1954.

Pointing the Way, translated by M. S. Friedman, to be published by Harper & Brothers in 1955.

²⁸ Buber's basic writings on philosophical anthropology are “What Is Man?”, the last long work in *Between Man and Man*, and “Distance and Relation,” *op. cit.* For his application of this anthropology to the problem of evil see “Images of Good and Evil” in *Good and Evil: Two Interpretations*, and my article “Martin Buber's New View of Evil,” *Judaism*, Vol. II, No. 3 (July, 1953), pp. 239-246.

Early Methodism and the Quakers

JOHN C. BOWMER

WHEN JOHN WESLEY began his life mission to England in 1738, George Fox had been dead nearly half a century and his followers were of the third and the fourth generation of Quakers. The movement called "The Society of Friends" was born towards the end of the seventeenth century in a period of general religious unrest. It really began when George Fox, a man of about thirty years of age, found a sympathetic hearing for his unorthodox ideas in a sect known as "The Seekers"; and before long he embarked upon an energetic campaign against all formalism, both religious and secular. He and his followers were persecuted; they were detested by Conformist and Nonconformist, Laudian and Puritan alike. He was in prison from 1664 to 1666. Towards the end of the century, however, the organization of scattered societies strengthened the movement, and at the coming of such men as Robert Barclay and William Penn a period of consolidation and expansion began.

By the middle of the eighteenth century, however, the Society of Friends shared the general torpor of the age. In his "Farther Appeal," Wesley notes this fact:

Do you not lean too much on the spirit and power which you believe rested upon your forefathers? Suppose it did! Will that avail *you*, if you do not drink into the same spirit? And how evident is this—that, whatever you once were, ye are now "shorn of your strength." Ye are weak and become like other men. The Lord is well nigh departed from you. Where is now the spirit, the life, the power? ¹

This was Quakerism as John Wesley knew it; though there can be no doubt that both movements—Methodism and Quakerism—were raised up, each in its own very different way, in the Providence of God to purify and revitalize the organized religion of the day. They both fulfilled that mission with considerable success.

¹ *Works of John Wesley*, VIII. 189.

JOHN C. BOWMER, M.A., B.D., is Minister of Seaham Methodist Church, Durham County, England. His article is a revision of an essay which received an Earys Essay Prize from the Ministerial Training Department of the British Methodist Conference, and was published in the London Quarterly and Holborn Review, April, 1950.

I

Now we must consider the founders of the two movements. They make an interesting and striking comparison. In appearance they were totally unlike each other. On the one hand George Fox wore his leathern breeches and a hat which he would not remove even at the passing of a King. He yelled his tirades against the "priests" and "steeple-houses" of the land in a quaint language which almost needed an interpreter. On the other hand John Wesley always wore the orthodox dress of a Church of England clergyman and was the essence of neatness. Punctual to the minute at all his appointments, he proclaimed his message with a plainness of speech which was characteristic of all he wrote and spoke.

The Journals of Wesley and Fox are typical of the men. Fox uses a vague, mystical language with which Wesley had little patience. For example, Fox writes: "I saw that there was an ocean of darkness and death; but an infinite ocean of light and love flowed over the ocean of darkness. In that also I saw the Infinite Love of God and I had great openings." Wesley wrote clearly and precisely, as became an Oxford don, schooled in logic; so we can understand his impatience with Fox's writings, and are not surprised at the comment he made to his Quaker friend, John Fry: "I do not want to say anything of George Fox; but I hope he was stark mad when he wrote that medley of nonsense, blasphemy, and scurrility styled his *Great Mystery*."² In the last paragraph of this letter, however, he says, "But I love and esteem you and many of the present Quakers,"—a sentence which shows Wesley's personal friendship with his correspondent and with many others of the Quaker persuasion.

It should be said here that John Wesley was fairly well acquainted with the history and tenets of the Quakers, so that when he criticised or commented upon their ways or beliefs, he did so with a well-informed mind. On 6th April, 1739, he read a *History of the Quakers* and in July of the same year he was studying Barclay—no doubt the *Apology*, upon which he commented so freely in a letter dated 10th February, 1748.³ While he was conversant with the writings of George Fox, he confessed that his knowledge of other Quaker literature was not extensive, "I have not studied the writings of the Quakers enough (having read few of them beside Robert Barclay) to say precisely what they mean by perceptible inspiration."⁴ His general attitude—to Fox in particular—was consistent

² *Letters of John Wesley*, VIII. 252.

³ *Letters of John Wesley*, II. 116.

⁴ Letter to John Smith, 25th June, 1746. *Letters*, II. 75.

with his impatience with mystical literature as a whole. He dealt severely with Jacob Behmen (Boehme) with whom George Fox had many affinities.

Fox and Wesley differed greatly in their attitude to the Church, its ministry and sacraments, and this was of vital importance. They were both possessed with a burning desire to reform and purify the religion of the land; but while Fox abandoned the Church and ridiculed her "steeple-houses," Wesley remained within, ever a loyal son to the Church at whose hand he suffered much infamy and persecution.

Then there were further differences of temperament and training. Fox was a mystic and he despised reason; Wesley was essentially practical and logical. Fox knew little, if any, church history; Wesley was well acquainted with the subject, especially that of the Early Church and the ante-Nicene Fathers. Fox regarded Hebrew, Greek, and Latin as the tongues of Babel. Since they were the languages used in writing the title on the Cross, he dismissed them as devices of the devil. On the other hand, Wesley knew his Hebrew and Greek Bible to the minutest detail and could converse in, as well as read, Latin; and he employed his knowledge in the service of the gospel. Both Fox and Wesley were serious students of the Bible. Fox knew the English version almost by heart. But there was a great difference in the degree of authority which each attached to the Bible. The Scriptures for Wesley constituted a "sufficient rule of faith and practice"; Fox subordinated those same Scriptures to the guidance of the Inner Light.

In their insistence upon the individual experience of the soul in its contact with the Divine, Fox and Wesley were at one; but while Fox stressed the dealings of God with the soul of man by means of the Inner Light, Wesley, himself having passed through the fires of conversion, insisted on the reality of sin and the fundamental need of a personal Savior.

These points of comparison between the two great men will go far to account for the relationship which existed between the societies they founded.

II

We must next consider the contacts between the Society of Friends and early Methodism. Wesley had many happy encounters with individual Quakers, whom he admired not least for their scrupulous cleanliness and their neat mode of dress. In his *Advice to the People called Meth-*

odists with regard to Dress (1760) he commended their customs to his own people:

Many years ago I observed several parts of Christian practice among the people called Quakers. Two things I particularly remarked among them—plainness of speech and plainness of dress. I willingly adopted both, with some restrictions, and particularly plainness of dress. I advise you to imitate them, First in the neatness, secondly in the plainness of their apparel.⁵

To the Irish Methodists he said, "Be cleanly; in this let the Methodists take pattern by the Quakers."⁶

When we recall that the Methodists were ever "the friends of all and the enemies of none" and that doctrinal tests were not imposed upon those who wished to join the Societies, it is not surprising that many Quakers found their way into the ranks of early Methodism. The Friends would find much in Methodism which they liked—the "free" nature of the Class Meetings, the emphasis upon holiness, the insistence upon an individual experience of the indwelling Christ. At the same time, there was much in Methodism which was incompatible with Quakerism; her churchmanship, for example, with its regard for the ministry and the sacraments.

Thus when a Quaker became a Methodist, Wesley insisted on baptism. As early as 1735, on the voyage to Georgia, Wesley baptized two Quakers, Thomas and Grace Hird, and then administered to them the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.⁷ That was three years before the birth of evangelical Methodism, but in later years Wesley's custom with regard to the baptism of Quakers did not change. For example, the following entries appear in the Journal for the dates mentioned:

1st May 1747—In the evening I preached near Skircoat Green, and baptised Eliz. K(ershaw), late a Quaker.
 30th April 1750—I baptised a man and a woman (late Quakers), as I had done another the night before.
 16th October 1756—I baptised Hannah C—, late a Quaker. God, as usual, bore witness to His ordinance.

Then there was Lucretia Smith, who is often referred to in the Journals of both John and Charles Wesley. She was a Quaker whom Wesley baptized in April, 1739. It would be difficult to estimate just how many people like Lucretia Smith entered the early Methodist Societies, but we do know that there were many Quakers among those who listened to John Wesley at Bristol.⁸ Charles says that many Quakers attended his preach-

⁵ *Works*, XI. 466.

⁶ *Letters*, V. 133.

⁷ *Journal of John Wesley*, I. 117.

⁸ *Letters of John Wesley*, I. 295, 309, 317.

ing at Thaxted on 31st May, 1739.⁹ George Whitefield had similar contacts.¹⁰

Contacts with individual Quakers gave Wesley much joy. At Sunderland, on 10th May, 1766, he spent "an agreeable hour at a Quaker's"; and when, on 27th June, 1749, he talked for two hours with a certain J(oshua) S(trangman), a Quaker, he comments, "I found it good for me to be with him: it enlivened and strengthened my soul."¹¹ This was in Ireland, where his associations with Quakers were very happy. On his second visit to that country, in April, 1748, he records: "The society now consists of about a hundred members; nine of whom were Papists, and several Quakers: seven of them, at their earnest desire, I baptised this day."¹²

When Wesley began building the Orphan house at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, he had only twenty-six shillings in the funds; but very soon he had a letter from a Quaker who offered him £100 for the project.¹³ In times of persecution, he was befriended by Quakers; and his brother Charles found the Quakers a restraining influence upon the mob at Evesham.¹⁴ It was through the good offices of a Quaker that a creditable report of the Methodists was given to George II, who is said to have given the assurance that no Methodist would be persecuted for his religion while he was on the throne.¹⁵ Finally, it must not be forgotten that Methodists and Quakers were allies in social work, and were perfectly at one in anti-slavery activities just before the death of John Wesley.¹⁶

These personal contacts with Quakers are really surprising when we remember that by both training and inclination the Wesleys were unsympathetic to some of the major tenets of the Friends. In fact, their father, Samuel Wesley, in his younger days, wrote an article in the Athenian Chronicle in which he classed the Quakers with the Papists and described them both as "so bad that they can hardly be called Christian." He stigmatized the Holy Club as being almost as bad as Quakerism.¹⁷ The two brothers, however, did not fail to recognize friends, even among the Quakers, when they met them.

⁹ *Journal of Charles Wesley*, I. 151.

¹⁰ Tyerman, *Life of George Whitefield*, I. 215-216.

¹¹ *Journal of John Wesley*, III. 407.

¹² *Ibid.*, 342.

¹³ See Henry Moore's *Life of Wesley*, I. 550.

¹⁴ *Journal of Charles Wesley*, I. 306-7.

¹⁵ Moore, Henry, *Life of Wesley*, ii. 2-3.

¹⁶ See Overton & Relton, *History of the English Church*, 265.

¹⁷ Clarke, Adam, *The Wesley Family*, II. 195-8.

Unfortunately the influence of Quakerism upon the early Methodist societies was not altogether helpful. On Saturday, 11th May, 1745, Wesley arrived back in London after a tour of his provincial societies, to find some of the London Society disaffected after reading Barclay's *Apology*. Wesley says:

I came to London. The sower of tares, I found, had not been idle, but shaken many, and moved some from their steadfastness, who once seemed to be pillars. The next week, finding no other way to convince some who were hugely in love with that solemn trifle, my brother and I were at the pains of reading over Robert Barclay's *Apology* with them. Being willing to receive the light, their eyes were opened. They saw his nakedness, and were ashamed.¹⁸

Charles Wesley refers to the same, "examining the classes with my brother" under the date of 21st May. Another disaffected person was "Poor John Webb" as John Wesley calls him:

Wednesday, 1st January, 1746—We dined with poor John Webb, now thoroughly poisoned by Robert Barclay's *Apology* which he was sure would do him no hurt, till all his love to his brethren was swallowed up in dotage about questions and strife of words.¹⁹

And John Webb had been so valiant during persecution at Wednesbury! It was the damage done by Quaker influence among the Methodists that calls forth Wesley's detailed examination and condemnation of Barclay's *Apology* in 1748.

III

So it became clear that however much the early Methodists were friendly with, and were befriended by, individual members of the Society of Friends, there were differences of attitude and emphasis which went far to restrict cooperation between the two bodies; and these divergences were upon matters so fundamental that any permanent alliance was impossible. We must now look at some of these doctrinal similarities and differences.

Methodism and Quakerism were both protests against lifelessness and formalism in the Church of their day; each reasserted the approach of the individual to God. Quakerism was born just after the Puritan regime, when disorder was rife in both Church and State. In the rivalry between Episcopalian and Presbyterian, the Church of England was torn and dazed. Piety and spiritual life had largely gone from her; preaching was almost extinct and the liturgy lifeless. Various efforts to produce

¹⁸ *Journal of John Wesley*, III. 177-8.

¹⁹ *Journal of John Wesley*, III. 232.

conformity had undermined the very conception of authority. The time was ripe for the advent of a prophet and he came in the person of George Fox. To him, the only reality was the response of the individual to the Inner Light. He had no place in his theology for agreed forms of religious exercise by which alone a company of believers can live and worship together. Even today there is no place in Quakerism for the rich patterns of worship which are available to Christians of both the Catholic and the Reformed traditions. To Fox, the sacraments were irrelevant, and the Bible was relegated to a place subordinate to the revealings of the Inner Light. Even the observing of fixed times of prayer was obnoxious to him.

In a very different way, Methodism was also a protest on behalf of the individual against a dead church—without relaxing its grip on the social aspects of religion, the worship, fellowship, and sacraments of the Church. It is easy to exaggerate the state of religion in the eighteenth century. No doubt it was at a very low ebb; but the researches of Dr. Lowther Clarke and Wickham Legg have shown that a measure of piety was present to which Wesley and others could appeal. As we know, Methodism was born when a band of young Oxford students became conscious of the poverty of their own spiritual life and saddened by the low state of religion in the Church. Their reaction took the form, not of eccentricities and protests like those of the Quakers, but of a more rigid observance of the traditional feasts and fasts of the Church. Methodism was reborn in May, 1738, when the emphasis changed and, again without relaxing his grip on the ordinances of the Church, Wesley proclaimed the necessity for a personal experience of redeeming grace. Thus we can see the essential differences between the Methodists and the Quakers. Really, they hinge around two main principles.

1. In the first place, to George Fox, the impact of God upon the individual soul was conceived as "*illumination*"; to become a Quaker, a person must be "*convinced*." To Wesley that impact was one of purifying fire, and the change was "*conversion*." Both can be described as the response of the individual to the call of the Divine; with Fox it is Inner Light, with Wesley it is both Light and heat:

Refining fire, go through my heart,
 Illuminate my soul,
Scatter Thy life through every part,
 And sanctify the whole.

At the same time, it would not be correct to say that while Methodism is emotional, Quakerism is intellectual. George Fox never gave to his fol-

lowers anything comparable to Wesley's *Sermons*, *Appeals*, and *Minutes*. In spite of the emotional outbursts which accompanied early Methodist preaching, Wesley and his brother were well schooled in theology and gave a sound intellectual basis to Methodism. He made his preachers read and study, and for the rank and file of his people prepared *The Christian Library*. Fox's deficiency of education and his general mental attitude precluded him from doing anything like that. Whatever refining and interpretative work had to be done in Quakerism was left to some of Fox's later disciples like Robert Barclay to do.

For the same reason, there is not in Fox anything comparable to Wesley's conception of the gravity of sin. Of that "depth of inbred sin" which runs through all early Methodist thought and life, Fox seems to know but little. He sought an inner illumination; Wesley an inner cleansing and empowering. The accounts of Fox and Wesley, taken from their *Journals*, stand in interesting contrast:

Fox: I heard a voice which said, "There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition;" and when I heard it my heart did leap for joy. . . . For though I read the scriptures, that spake of Christ and of God, yet I knew Him not, but by revelation, as He who hath the key did open and as the Father of life drew me to His Son.²⁰

Wesley: While he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away *my* sins, even *mine*, and saved *me* from the law of sin and death.²¹

It may be said that while Fox is in line with the Johannine conception of Illumination, Wesley is in line with the Pauline and Lutheran conception of Justification by Faith. Accordingly, it is not surprising that both Paul and Luther were represented in that society in Aldersgate Street when Wesley's heart was "strangely warmed"; nor is it to be wondered at that Fox's favorite texts are from the Fourth Gospel, e.g., "That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (1:9) and "I have called you friends" (15:15). Thus for half a century the early Methodists were calling men to repentance, offering Christ to a sinful world of men and women upon whom the Quakers made no impression except by appearing to them as pitiable eccentrics.

The idea of Illumination, and Christ the source thereof, was not absent from the thought of the Wesleys. Charles Wesley expounds the idea of Christ the Light in a hymn which might well have been written

²⁰ *The Journal of George Fox* (1765 edition), p. 7.

²¹ *The Journal of John Wesley*, I. 475-6.

by a Quaker; but the Quakers produced no hymn writer of note until John Greenleaf Whittier (1807-1892). Wesley says:

Not all the powers of hell can fright
 A soul, that walks with Christ in light;
 He walks, and cannot fall:
 Clearly he sees, and wins his way,
 Shining unto the perfect day,
 And more than conquers all.

Light of the world, Thy beams I bless;
 On thee, bright Sun of Righteousness,
 My faith hath fix'd its eye;
 Guided by Thee, through all I go,
 Nor fear the ruin spread below,
 For Thou art always nigh.

Here is no stumbling "amid the encircling gloom," nor a mere inner illumination, but a Divine radiance lighting all the Christian's path.

Fox and Wesley also differ in their attitude toward the Spirit of God. Fox, again akin to the Johannine outlook, conceives of the Spirit as the source of revelation. Wesley, predominantly Pauline, emphasizes the Witness of the Spirit that we are children of God. To the Quakers, the revelations of the Spirit "are not to be subjected to the examination of the Scriptures as to a touchstone";²² to which Wesley replied, "The Scriptures are the touchstone whereby Christians examine all, real or supposed revelations."²³ The fact is that the early Methodists recognized only the experience of the Spirit which worked itself out in "holiness of heart and life." In his *Farther Appeal*, Wesley takes up this very point with the Quakers: "Art thou acquainted with the 'leading of the Spirit' not by notion only, but by living experience? I fear very many of you talk of this, who do not so much as know what it means. How does the Spirit of God lead His children to this or that particular action?"²⁴

2. In the second place, there was *the attitude to the Church, its ministry and its sacraments*. From the first, George Fox adopted an attitude of hostility to the Established Church and dismissed the Holy Communion from his religious exercises. True, he lived at a time when the spiritual life of the Church was very low and when it was passing through turbulent days; but the same could be said of both the Established Church and of Nonconformity in Wesley's day. In the early eighteenth century the Church of England was plagued with fox-hunting parsons and absentee rectors, the Nonconformists were drifting towards Arianism; but Wesley

²² Wesley, quoting Barclay's *Apology* in his letter of 10th February, 1748 (*Letters*, II. 117).

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Works of John Wesley*, VIII. 188.

did not, on that account, repudiate the Church or scorn her sacraments. On the contrary, he insisted that Methodism involved no separation from the Church of England, even when such an assertion seemed to be belied by events. The respective attitudes of Quaker and Methodist to the Church of England were alone sufficient to render impossible any close union between the two Societies.

With regard to worship, the Quakers did not believe in appointing set times for prayer. In the letter of 10th February, 1748, already referred to, Wesley discusses this point. With Barclay as the source of his knowledge of Quakerism, Wesley takes the statement that the Quakers worship only "when we are moved thereto by the Holy Spirit." Wesley first replies on a point of logic showing that Barclay does not define the term, "moved by the Spirit," and then proceeds to argue that there is no Scripture warrant for Barclay's statement. Then he attacks the contention from his experience. Wesley was a man who lived by giving every moment its allotted task; he worked and prayed and traveled to a time-table. The Quaker regarded this as "will-worship," but it was the secret of Wesley's efficiency. He knew from experience that praying or preaching at fixed times did not hinder him; rather it was the secret of his success. "Preaching and prayer at appointed times have begotten faith both at Bristol and Poulton."²⁵

Early Methodism had little in common with Quaker worship. Barclay had written: "Silence is a principal part of God's worship—that is, men's sitting silently together, ceasing from all outwards, from their own words and actings, in the natural will and comprehension, and feeling after the inward seed of life." He had then quoted a number of biblical texts, which Wesley dismisses as quite irrelevant to the subject of worship. The truth is, Wesley had had quite enough of quietism in his contest with Philip Molther, the Apostle of Stillness, and he was too shrewd not to see that for most people such a doctrine cut the sinews of Christian effort.

He was also too well trained in the ordinances of the Christian Church to surrender them lightly. The meetings of the two bodies were in striking contrast—the Quakers with their prolonged silence, and the Methodists with their fervent prayer and singing. They may have been akin in the liberty of utterance which they gave to those so moved by the Spirit; but the Quakers regarded their meetings as "worship," while Wesley never regarded his class meetings as such. He always asserted that Methodist meetings presupposed the ordered worship of the parish church.²⁶

²⁵ *Letters of John Wesley*, II. 122.

²⁶ *Leeds Conference, 1766; Tyerman, Life and Times of John Wesley*, II. 576.

An eloquent comment upon Wesley's attitude to Quaker worship is to be found in his letter, dated 10th August, 1772, to Mary Stokes, who was evidently attracted towards the Society of Friends:

When you enter into your closet and shut the door and pray to your Father who seeth in secret, then is the time to groan to Him who reads the heart the unutterable prayer. But to be silent in the congregation of His people is wholly new, and therefore wholly wrong. A silent meeting was never heard of in the Church of Christ for sixteen hundred years. I entreat you to read over with much prayer that little tract *A Letter to a Quaker*. . . . Go not near the tents of those dead, formal men called Quakers!²⁷

With regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Quakers denied that it was instituted by our Lord, and argued that all life was sacramental. Barclay says, "The breaking of bread by Christ with His disciples was but a figure, and ceases in such as have obtained the substance."²⁸ The Wesleys held that the injunction "Do this" was absolutely binding upon Christians. So Charles Wesley sang:

Ah, tell us no more
The Spirit and power
Of Jesus our God
Is not to be found in this life-giving food!

Did Jesus ordain
His supper in vain,
And furnish a feast
For none but His earliest servants to taste?²⁹

We would suggest that the Wesleys did more for the cause of Christ by adhering to the Church's worship and sacraments, reforming her ways and revitalizing her life, than did George Fox, who retired to ridicule and denounce from without. Wesley saw that it was not a case of the means of grace having been tried and found wanting, but of their not being tried. He thus continually exhorted his followers to attend Church and Sacrament, even to the point of insisting that administration by an evil-living clergyman would not invalidate the ordinance.³⁰ One of his sermons, written originally for his pupils at Oxford in 1733 and republished in 1788 for the Methodist people, is entitled "The Duty of Constant Communion."

With these principles, the Methodists could not make close allies of the Quakers. To become a Methodist and fulfil Wesley's injunctions was in effect to deny some of the fundamental tenets of the Society of Friends.

²⁷ *Letters of John Wesley*, V. 334-5.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, II. 124.

²⁹ "Hymns on the Lord's Supper," No. 92; *Poetical Works*, III. 282.

IV. CONCLUSION

In origin, Methodism and Quakerism were great prophetic movements, each led by a great prophetic soul. They were in their own way each a protest against lifelessness and decadence in the Church. Dr. H. B. Workman has called Methodism the "Montanism of the Eighteenth Century";³¹ and with Montanism, the Quakers had also much in common. However, where Quakerism went off into mysticism and eccentricities, Methodism remained anchored by its leader to the traditions of its mother Church and steered clear of anarchy and irrationalism. The Society of Friends inherited a type of thought from Jacob Behmen, whose writings are described by Dr. Rufus Jones as "very uneven, and containing a heavy and unfortunate legacy from alchemy and theosophy." Wesley's opinion is expressed in no uncertain manner. In 1742, he judged Behmen's *Mysterium Magnum* to be "most sublime nonsense, inimitable bombast, fustian not to be paralleled."³² Wesley had little sympathy with any form of mystical or speculative theology; he himself was essentially practical. His theology was "applied theology"; the class meeting was the laboratory where his data were verified. The standards he left for his followers were not treatises, but sermons; and Charles's legacy was similar—not theories to argue about, but hymns to sing.

We might conclude by saying that the relationship between early Methodism and the Society of Friends was this. Contacts between individual Methodists and individual Quakers were frequent and generally happy. Wesley enjoyed more than one conversation with Quakers and more than once was indebted to them for help and hospitality. Several Quakers found their way into the early Methodist Societies, though sometimes there were disturbing results. On the other hand, while early Methodism had points of contact through the nature of their origins and in their emphasis upon the response and responsibilities of the individual to the Divine, there were deep cleavages which made close union impossible. Perhaps the most succinct expression of those cleavages, and also of the attitude of Wesley to Quakerism, is found in his letter to John Smith:

Between me and them there is a great gulf fixed. The sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper keep us at a wide distance from each other; insomuch that, according to the view of things I have now, I should as soon commence Deist as Quaker.³³

³⁰ See Standard Sermon XII, also Sermon CIV in *Works*, VII. 174.

³¹ *The Place of Methodism in the Catholic Church*, p. 59.

³² *Journal of John Wesley*, III. 17.

³³ *Letters of John Wesley*, II. 75. Written on 25th June, 1746.

The Credentials of a Cleric

HERBERT A. KECK

WHEN VOLTAIRE WAS on his deathbed a priest came to shrive him. "From whom do you come, M. L'Abbé?" asked Voltaire. "From God himself," was the answer. "Well, well, Sir," said Voltaire, "Your credentials?"¹ That is precisely what the world says to the preacher—"Your credentials?" To those who profess to interpret the Will of God unto the people, the world says in fact, if not in so many words, "Who commissioned you? By whose authority do you speak? What qualifications do you possess for so exalted a task?" In the light of what has just been said we purpose to discuss a bit "the credentials of a cleric." As we conceive them the credentials of a cleric are intrinsic rather than extrinsic qualities.

I

The first credential we would accentuate is the possession of clear-eyed intelligence. The prophet must be a solitary thinker; not mass-minded, but one who does a deal of thinking on his own account.

It is too much to expect every preacher to be a person of creative intelligence. Men of creative intelligence are few in any field. But it is not too much to expect him to be a person of studious habits, open-minded, hospitable to truth from any quarter. He ought not to be one of those "conservative folk who are cross at the agony of a new idea."

We have heard a deal about the troubles of a dynamic minister with a static congregation. We have no doubt much could be profitably written about the troubles of a dynamic congregation with a static minister. Ministers cannot be scholars perhaps in the technical sense, but they should be serious students of the problems of faith. The world has a right to expect them to be men of culture, "knowing something of the best the world has thought and said." No amount of piety in a preacher will atone for mental vacuity. A cleric must depend more upon his logic than upon

¹ Durant, W., *The Story of Philosophy*, p. 487.

HERBERT A. KECK, S.T.B., D.D., was formerly pastor of Kenwood Methodist Church, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. He now resides at Evanston, Illinois, writes and lectures.

his lungs for convincing effects in his pulpit ministrations. As a rule men must be shown, rather than shouted, into the Kingdom of Heaven.

A colored preacher, on one occasion, kept pounding the pulpit and saying, "What we wants is more powah, more powah!" Whereupon a big, black deacon arose in the back of the meeting-house and said, "Elder, what we wants is not more powah, but more idees."

In the early days of the Republic a rough and ready type of preaching was adequate, but now conditions are settled; every congregation has many high school graduates and a sprinkling of college graduates, and a more refined type of preaching is demanded. We need now to bring the resources of a well-furnished intellect to bear upon the task.

When I was a lad, the saints were wont to point to the accomplishments of Moody with his slender mental equipment; but nothing is more significant in the career of D. L. Moody than his growing emphasis, through the years, upon education. When he visited London he was introduced to Mr. W. E. Gladstone. The first thing Gladstone said after the introduction was, "Mr. Moody, I wish I had your shoulders," and Moody instantly retorted, "Mr. Gladstone, I wish I had your head."

The preacher-man cannot know too much, provided he is thoroughly consecrated. All a man's intellectual resources can be laid under tribute in the proclamation of the gospel. There are too many sermons which remind us of the coffee cans on the shelf, marked with the label "vacuum packed." The church has suffered from a deal of breezy, inspirational preaching which did not come to grips with the difficult questions of faith. A large part of the preacher's task today is to correlate essential Christianity with the fresh knowledge of the modern world. He is to interpret the Eternal Gospel in thought-forms that are intelligible to modern-minded men and women.

There is small danger of a cleric preaching over the heads of his congregation, for profoundest truths may be put into simplest terms. The greater peril lies in preaching beside the heads of his congregation, being interested in things about which his hearers do not care. Bishop William A. Quayle was always insisting that the secret of effective preaching was interest; and interest means, according to its etymology, inter-est, that which is between.

Great preaching comes out of deep brooding; of all men, the minister needs to meditate. To meditate means to get into the middle of a thing. What a pity when the preacher is content to be a church manager; when he elects to be absorbed in secondary things rather than giving prime

attention to "prayer and the ministry of the Word." We would do well to make our own the words the late Bishop C. H. Brent took as a sort of life motto: "Think things through and you'll think things true."

It is unfortunate when clerics talk disparagingly about theology. To discredit theology is to discredit intelligence itself. The Christian facts must have a language in which to utter themselves. What men should decry is not theology but the dogmatic perversion of theology. If the physician must know his *materia medica*; if the lawyer must be acquainted with his *Blackstone*; then the preacher must know his theology. It is his intellectual undergirding. No doubt theology needs to be simplified and correlated with fresh knowledge.

The Christian ministry has lost the intellectual prestige it enjoyed in former days. Time was when the minister was "the Parson," i.e., the Person, the educated person in the community. That day has long since passed; now in nearly every community are men and women who are our intellectual peers. If we are to maintain standing and hold the respect of cultivated people we must manifest ability to think objectively, and give assurance that we do not speak merely to a brief. Awhile back, Professor George Santayana remarked, "People wouldn't become ministers unless they had rather second-rate minds." It is for us to prove by our intellectual vigor that Professor Santayana was quite mistaken. Never should we forget the solemn warning of Dr. J. H. Jowett, "If the study is a lounge, then the pulpit is an impertinence."²

Today a mean retail spirit seems to have taken possession of many ministers. They deal too much in trivial matters and show reluctance to grapple with the profound questions of the Christian faith. There is too much of what has been called "suburban preaching." By which is meant dealing with peripheral matters. For a generation and more, preaching has been predominantly ethical. There will always be need for ethical preaching; but Christianity, be it remembered, is not a religious ethic but an ethical religion. In Christianity the "Is" precedes the "ought," the indicative comes before the imperative. The gospel is a way of living, but a way of thinking is implicit in that way of living. There is such a thing as a Christian world view and a Christian philosophy of life.

If we seem severe in insistence on the preacher's intellectual qualifications, we would exhort the laity not to think of themselves more highly than they ought to think. As clerics we are conscious of our limitations and would repeat what old Dr. Bellows said years ago, that "one of the

² Jowett, J. H., *The Preacher and His Life Work*.

strongest proofs of the divine origin of Christianity is that she has survived her ministry." But we would remind the lay folk that to date the only thing we have found to make preachers out of is laymen, and that "the stupidity of the pulpit is only the dedicated stupidity of the pew."

II

A second credential of a cleric is the note of reality. By reality we mean firsthand contact with the Christian verities. Experience is the touchstone of reality. Dr. Sylvester Horne, in a glowing book,³ reminded us that what the world wants to know today is not so much that our religion is reasonable as that it is real. The mood of doubt today is not willful, but wistful. The peril of the preacher is not hypocrisy but an unconscious unreality. How easy it is to simulate sentiments that we do not feel. Many an unctuous prayer and many a thrilling sermon but damns the deeper the unreal soul that utters them.

My old professor of homiletics used to warn us against what he called "a certain fatal facility of speech." The ministry is the hardest calling in the world in which to be sincere. The minister is a dealer in words and he is constantly put to it to keep his words vital.

Colonel Ingersoll used to say that on the stage they pretend to be natural, and in the pulpit it is natural to pretend. There is a sting in that witticism that should give us pause. It was finely said of an eminent divine that "he never trafficked in the false commerce of a truth unfelt." We preach with power only when "our words come alive and walk up and down in the hearts of our hearers."

Dr. W. J. Dawson told of an English criminal who was being led to his execution on the scaffold and was being offered by the prison chaplain what are known as "the consolations of religion." The wretched man turned fiercely upon the chaplain and cried, "Do you really believe that? If you believe that, why did you not act as if it were true, why did you not act as if you cared? If I believed that, I would crawl across England on broken glass to tell men that it was true."

It is one thing to get truth off, but it is quite another thing to get truth home. The only truth we get home is personalized truth. There is no use preaching unless a man deals with reality. Eloquence is nothing; dramatic power nothing; fire and passion are nothing unless they represent reality. It is reality that sways the mind, stirs the heart, and moves the will to action.

³ Horne, S., *The Romance of Preaching*, 1914, p. 125.

At times we have been left cold by divines who were reputed to be somewhat; and then, at other times we have been deeply moved by humble preachers because they spoke pure flame. What the pulpit needs is not so much brilliance as reality; after a time, even brilliance palls on people.

It is reported that a minister was one day giving his son some good advice. When he had finished, the lad looked up and said, "Do you mean that, daddy, or are you just preaching?" Beneath the humor of that incident is a tragic note. The curse of such preaching is its conventionalism; it is just preaching and nothing more.

The key to unreality in religion is its divorce from experience. Every day the minister should lift to heaven the prayer, "Oh, God, make me real!" Of all men he should, in Browning's phrase be "very sure of God." We can get people no nearer to God than we are ourselves.

III

A third credential of a cleric is humanness. The Master's favorite designation of himself was "The Son of Man." One wonders if he did not love it because it expressed his kinship with humankind. Christ's divinity was expressed not in spite of his humanity but *in and through* his humanity. Jesus was human to the red-ripe of the heart, and so "touched with the feeling of our infirmities."

Dr. William F. Warren used to remind us in his course on Religions at Boston University that in the Buddhist list of ordination questions there was this one, "Art thou a human being?" The question was thrice repeated, and no man could be ordained to the Buddhist priesthood unless he would declare that he was a human being. I have often thought that same query, "Art thou a human being?" might appropriately be put to every candidate for the Christian ministry.

There are certain ministers people would not think of turning to in time of trouble. They are not human but forbidding, unapproachable. They cultivate an aloofness which suggests that they regard themselves as "too good for human nature's daily food." The other extreme is those preachers who are known as "regular fellows." They are industrious jokers, slappers on the back, callers of first names. Let us not be deceived, people see through those regular fellows.

The trouble with the Priest and Levite in the New Testament parable was that they had become dehumanized. They did not respond to the call of humanity. What a pity when the preacher is dehumanized; when

he cares more for sermons than for souls; when he is keener about ideas than he is about folk. Sermons are valuable, but only as instruments of good to human beings. One human spirit is worth more than all the sermons in the world. Truth is not for truth's sake but truth is for life's sake.

There is considerable ground for the suspicion that the average minister does not meet life fairly and squarely as ordinary people have to live it. The nine run of humans have small concern about dogmas. Their real problems center about such matters as sex, and love, and bread, and money, and temptation, and death. Doctrines there must be, since man is a rational being, but they should impinge on the things stated. If we touched the raw, elemental things of life we might minister more effectively to our fellows.

It is this humanness that makes ministers real shepherds of the flock of Christ, binding up their wounds, helping them over the hard places, leading them into green pastures and beside still waters, protecting them from the wolves that devour and destroy.

It is reported that in England there is a grave with this epitaph: "John Jones born a man, died a grocer." What a pity when a minister sinks his humanness in his profession; when at the close of his career it must be said, "Born a man, died a preacher."

We like what Halford Luccock said, that for ministerial efficiency a man must be familiar not with one, but with four trinities.

1. Father, Son and Holy Ghost.
2. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.
3. Peter, James and John.
4. Tom, Dick and Harry.

I am thinking of a minister of rich and ripe humanity, Dr. Theodore Cuyler, for forty years pastor of a certain church in Brooklyn. He was wont to say, "I don't want to go to heaven; I want to stay down here with the folk." He once explained the hold he had on his people by saying, "I love them to death all the week, and hit them clean between the eyes every Sunday morning."

IV

The fourth credential of a cleric is spirituality. By spirituality we mean Christliness in character and conduct. That Old Testament term for the prophet is significant: "a man of God." Henry Ward Beecher once remarked to a company of clergymen, "You cannot preach cream while

you are living skim milk. You cannot eat garlic in private without smelling of it in public."

Preaching in some real sense is autobiographical. What a man *is* gets into his message. It has been keenly remarked that "real preaching is not so much a demonstration of what a man can do, as it is a revelation of what a man *is*." The Christian ministry is the only profession which consists in *being something*; of all men the cleric must heed Ralph Waldo Emerson's words to a fellow human, "What you *are* speaks so loud, I cannot hear what you *say*."

The laity will forgive a good deal in a minister. He may be lame in his logic, he may be short on learning; and they will not hold it too much against him so long as they have confidence in his integrity. But one thing they will not forgive, and that is moral dereliction.

Frederick Denison Maurice was a London preacher of great power. At the close of one of his services a visitor came out completely awed and subdued. He was heard to say, "There was something not of this world." When a preacher is surcharged with the Spirit of God, we get precisely that impression.

Of all men the minister must not neglect the cultivation of his own spiritual life. Like a church bell he frequently calls to prayer, but goes not himself. One cleric confessed the other day, "I seldom get time to pray any more, except in public." But prayer is to the preacher what original research is to the scientist; it is his means of sure contact with reality.

Without a strong spiritual life, preaching may be illuminating but not vitalizing. It may scintillate but does not sanctify. It is the mystical *sense of God* that fructifies in the regeneration of the heart and the inspiration of the life. We preachers often lose what in radio we call "contact," and then we try in vain to make up in pep what is lacking in prophecy. The Spirit of God is the prophetic spirit. We are never really prophetic unless the Spirit of the Eternal is upon us.

The Master-preacher said, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach." If Jesus needed that induement, then certainly we lesser preachers need it too. Certainly we should make assiduous preparation for the ministry of the Word. It is wise counsel: "Prepare as if it all depended upon you, and preach as if it all depended upon God." When we rely upon the Spirit, words greater than our own are often given to us. Such words possess a peculiar touching quality, a power of appeal to the heart and will, which the studied products of reason

seldom attain. It is an arch heresy that the day of inspiration is at an end. God still breathes his Spirit upon those who proclaim the word of life.

The Christian ministry never fell upon more difficult days than these. It is a time of troubles. It is a day of inward confusion and outward chaos. Secularism threatens to engulf us. Men are challenging the very bases of faith. Today the gospel is challenged as it has not been challenged since the Apostolic Age. We may well say, "Who is sufficient for these things?" We feel weak and inadequate to the task.

It will hearten us to remember Moses, who shrank from the mission laid upon him, and cried, "Who am I, that I should go unto Pharaoh?" But God gave him the true angle for every prophet's attitude toward duty, when he replied (in substance), "Moses, the question is not who you are, but who I am," and then he gave him the warrant of the ineffable name, "I am that I am." Serene in confidence that the Eternal reinforces our endeavors, we cannot fail. The universe backs the good, and one day we shall witness the practical supremacy of righteousness on this planet.

Operation Bootstrap

The Task of the Church in Indonesia

WINBURN T. THOMAS

OUTSIDE HOLLAND, the Western world knows little concerning Indonesia, and less concerning the nation's Christian movement. Two recent visitors explain "the enigma of Indonesia" on the basis of the nationality of missionary personnel. They point out that since few Americans (or English) have worked in Indonesia, there has been little interpretation of the churches of these islands to the English-speaking world.¹

The initial ignorance with which newcomers approach Indonesia frequently gives way to sympathy and enthusiasm. James A. Michener admits that ". . . every shred of sympathy and identification in my body allied me with this new nation. Spiritually I became an Indonesian. I discovered that inwardly I was urging this youthful country on. If I were a young man in Asia today I would prefer being an Indonesian."² British journalist Harry Hopkins says, "There is a sense of hope abroad in the land which communicates itself to the visitor."³ German banker Dr. Hjalmar Schacht said toward the end of his technical mission, "I am optimistic about this country. It is rich. Its young men are able. When it gets security, when morale is restored, Indonesia will go so fast ahead it will astonish you."

The islands constituting this Republic are situated between the South China Sea and the Indian Ocean, between Asia and Australia. Their neighbors to the north are the Malay Peninsula and the Philippines. One group is southerly, forming a long thin line on the map; *Sumatra*, a large long island; then *Java*, smaller and thinner, to the southeast; then many small islands including *Bali* and the extreme eastern *Timor*. North of this formation is the large, solid island of *Borneo*, mostly Indonesian,

¹ *The Anderson-Smith Report on Theological Education in SE Asia*. Nanking Theological Seminary, Board of Founders, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, 1952, p. 31.

² *The Voice of Asia*, Bantam Books, 1951, p. 159.

³ *New World Arising*, Hamish Hamilton, London, England, p. 169.

WINBURN T. THOMAS, Ph.D., who has been a Presbyterian missionary in Asia since 1933, is now Field Representative for the American mission boards cooperating in the ecumenical program administered through the Indonesia Council of Churches.

though the northern edge is British. East of Borneo and south of the Philippines is *Celebes*, "the orchid on the equator." East of Celebes, again, are the *Moluccas*, the "Spice Islands" which Columbus sought in 1492. Finally, Western New Guinea (*Irian*) is claimed both by the Netherlands and by Indonesia.

In the present article the following places will be mentioned: *Djakarta*, on the western end of Java, the capital of the Republic of Indonesia, formerly called by the Dutch "Batavia"; *Sunda*, district on Java which includes Djakarta; *Batak*, a district in West Sumatra; *Kalimanten*, Indonesian Borneo; *Minahasa*, the tip end of the northern arm of Celebes; *Makassar*, city at the extreme southwest corner of Celebes; *Ambon*, capital of the Moluccas. The term "Eastern Indonesia" will refer to all the islands east of Java.

The Indonesian Christian community is among the strongest in Asia. Approximately three out of every four of the more than three million Christians are Protestant. Most of these are members of the twenty-eight church bodies that are related to the Indonesian Council of Churches. The 85,000 Javanese and Sundanese Protestants constitute the largest ex-Moslem Christian community in the world. Then at least 100,000 other Protestants on Java are of Chinese extraction, or have come from Eastern Indonesia or West Sumatra. Twenty-five of the 213 members of Parliament are Christians, as is the first vice-chairman, M. Tambunan. Many Christians, such as long-time Cabinet Minister Dr. J. Leimena, stand high in national affairs and general esteem because of demonstrated integrity. Such evidences as these are guarantees of continuing Christian influence in the life and affairs of the developing Republic.

Yet Christians view the future with considerable trepidation. The real Christian strength is found in the outer provinces, whereas Indonesia increasingly is dominated by Java. Indonesian church bodies lack the resources with which to evangelize the non-Christian and strongly Moslem areas. In many instances church income is insufficient to balance expenses. Denominationalism, introduced primarily since the recent closing of China by American missionaries, is becoming increasingly evident. Trained leadership is needed for the local churches, for Christian schools, and for public posts; the churches lack adequate personnel even to undertake the training.

Though standing in need of outside assistance, three centuries of colonial conditioning make all foreign aid suspect. Western churches and sending societies may need to go not only the second, but possibly the tenth

mile, in understanding and dealing sympathetically with this mood of suspicion which derives from centuries of dealing with the white man on a basis of inequality. Only a mission policy and personnel purged of all paternalism and superiority can assist the Indonesian church bodies to strengthen their own inner witness and extend the Christian community throughout this, Asia's youngest republic, and the world's seventh largest nation.

I. VITALIZATION OF THE GOSPEL PROCLAMATION

The larger church bodies in Indonesia have a mass-movement history. These are found primarily in animistic regions that were reached by Christian missionaries prior to the arrival of Islam in those areas. The Batak Church in West Sumatra and the Minahasa and Timor churches in Eastern Indonesia are examples. The postwar growth of the churches in Timor, and on some of the islands of the South Moluccas or Spice Islands, illustrates that the movement of masses of animists into the Christian community continues. The major task of the churches in these areas is to Christianize the Christians; that is, through instruction to nurture them into full church membership; and to hold the Christian youth in the face of sectarianism and secular influences.

Other church bodies, particularly on Java, have been created by converting Moslems, one by one, to Christianity. That method always has been slow. Today it is slower still, though Christian workers do report occasional requests from Moslems for instruction and even baptism. The moderating influence of the Indonesian religious climate, which insists that one religion is as good as another, has infected the Christians. Moslem leaders complain that Moslems tend to reach comparable conclusions. This tendency was accentuated during the revolution when Christians, suspected by their Moslem neighbors of being pro-Dutch, were required to demonstrate their nationalism or risk extermination. Christians still feel this pressure to conform, both because of the strong nationalism which prevails and because of "the renaissance of Islam."

Leaders of the Church of Minahasa (335,000 members), located at the tip of the Celebes, near the Philippines, are seeking to combat sectarianism and the challenge of secularism by a "Youth for Christ Movement" within the church. Pentecostal groups have added 40,000 Minahasans during the past ten years, youth having been attracted by the "gospel" music, the friendly meetings, and the informal worship of these churches. A social program has been de-

veloped by a number of the congregations of the "Protestant Church"⁴ to hold the youth against western movies, ballroom dancing, and other secularized forms of commercial entertainment. Two orphanages have been started, in part to answer Communist charges that Christians are not concerned with problems of this world. The Y.M.C.A., organized July, 1951, provides a program of student housing, schools, organized recreation, and ecumenical religious activities designed to attract and hold Indonesian youth. Some Christians, as well as Moslems, are realizing that the defense against Communism requires not only a frontal attack but also war against poverty and the social conditions which breed dissatisfaction and frustration.

II. THE ACHIEVEMENT OF SELF-SUPPORT

"Before the Japanese occupation we used to discuss the necessity of self-support, but didn't do anything about it. The Japanese arrival forced us to become self-supporting," explained one of the Indonesian church leaders. Though denied the gradual devolution which American mission boards regard as necessary transition for younger churches, the Indonesian church bodies survived the war. The postwar resources available from foreign and Indonesian sources have not been equal in purchasing power to those the churches enjoyed prior to 1939 when the war in Europe terminated much Indonesian assistance. Having been forced to become self-supporting, many of the church leaders now covet a continuation of this condition. A Dutch missionary upon his return to one of the islands off the Southwest coast of Sumatra was told by the Christian inhabitants that they lacked for nothing; although he could see that they needed everything material, they left him no alternative but to take his departure.

The fact that many of the churches accept no foreign subsidy does not mean that the 3,500 evangelists and pastors who care for the 4,000 organized congregations are paid in full by the local bodies. Rather, 3,000 of them supplement the meager payments of the churches by non-ecclesiastical activities, such as school teaching, farming, or even by commercial enterprise. Most of the 500 ordained ministers do devote themselves fully to church work, but so small are their salaries that a considerable number of others have accepted government posts or teaching positions in order to care properly for their families.

⁴ The term "Protestant Church" is used in this paper solely to designate the former established "Church of the Indies." The four branches of this Church—Minahasa, the South Moluccas, Timor, and Western Indonesia, with a total membership of almost one million—have no direct contacts with European mission boards. The twenty-four other Indonesian and Chinese church bodies have enjoyed long missionary histories, and retain to this day some degree of contact with their original Western sending societies.

Those church bodies which developed out of activities of the missionaries have been confronted with the necessity for self-support since their inception, even though initially they were in full or in part supported by the founding missions. The members have been taught stewardship, the ministers have supplemented clerical salaries by outside employment. The problem and position of these churches have remained virtually unchanged with the coming of independence, save that inflation has reduced the purchasing power of money. The "Protestant Church," which until 1950 was subsidized by the state (save during the Japanese occupation) and only in 1935 was disestablished, has suffered most from the occupation and changes inherent in national independence.

The congregations of the Church of the South Moluccas have planted gardens in order to supplement voluntary contributions of members. The sale of cash crops, such as cocoa and spices, is expected to pay the allocations of Synod headquarters. Many of the congregations on Timor own cattle, the sale of which augments church income. The Minahasa Synod operates a copra plantation, especially to provide pensions for ministers. Fancy Fairs (bazaars) are held by many of the church bodies for purposes of raising large sums of money. These events usually are successful, because they are a Christian version of the *Selamatian* (festival) which is a common feature of Indonesian life. These Fancy Fairs also serve the purpose of bringing the members of the churches together in cooperative activities.

III. RECONSTRUCTION

The "Protestant" churches of eastern Indonesia, though suffering greatly from wartime destruction during the decade following December 7, 1941, have "lifted themselves by their bootstraps" in a nation in which building has lagged behind population growth. Especially is this true of Minahasa and Timor, each of which has erected new houses of worship, offices and headquarters buildings on sites of prewar structures. The Moluccas, which have suffered both from international and civil war, have hardly had time to begin a full rebuilding campaign which will involve seventy-five or eighty new church structures. The government has given some subsidy toward the rebuilding of a half-dozen of the largest church buildings in Minahasa, and has provided most of the funds for the erection of a large new Protestant Church for Ambon, capital city of the Moluccas. The dozen new churches and headquarters on Timor have been erected solely by effort of the members, using local products and building cooperatively. The Chinese congregations both on Java and the other

islands have engaged in considerable building activity, not to reconstruct but to provide suitable worship centers for their expanding memberships.

Throughout Indonesia there is need for better accommodations for churches, schools, and hospitals. The European boards which traditionally carried the responsibility have been unable to assist. Many of the 3,000 Christian schools are in need of major repairs. The hospital buildings, most of which are prewar, have not been kept in repair over the past decade. Some church bodies have explicitly requested assistance, e.g., the Church of Minahasa and the Church of Bali, from Western boards and ecumenical agencies. "If labor, wood and stone were sufficient, we could rebuild by our own efforts," explained the minister of a large congregation, whose church had been erased by an Allied bomb. "Unfortunately we need cement, some steel, fixtures and glass as well. We do not have the funds with which to purchase these." The inflated costs of building generally have complicated the efforts of the churches as well as the nation at large.

IV. INTERCHURCH COOPERATION AND UNITY

The ending of the war saw the formation of a number of union and ecumenical organizations. The Churches of Eastern Indonesia formed a Council of Churches with headquarters at Makassar, on the island of Celebes, which at that time was the capital of the State of Eastern Indonesia. The Organizing Secretary, Rev. W. J. Rumambi, later became the organizing secretary and first General Secretary of the Indonesian Council of Churches with headquarters in Djakarta, the capital. The stated object of this national body, incorporated into the constitution that was adopted by twenty-nine constituent church bodies, was "to form a single, united church in Indonesia."

The five Chinese church bodies on Java affiliated with the Indonesian Council of Churches have formed also a Council of Chinese Churches, for the stated purpose of establishing a relation with the World Council of Churches (they have a combined total of less than 25,000 baptized members). Following the Oslo World Youth Conference in 1947, the Indonesia delegates formed a federation of Christian youth organizations, the M.P.K.O. The Dutch, Chinese, and Indonesian Student Christian Movements formed a single national movement early in 1950. The Theological School of Middle Java and the Theological College in Djakarta have been conversing concerning the establishment of a single Faculty of Theology.

These moves toward unity were in part attributable to the ecumenical

temper of the times, in part to the political mood of the nation which was moving from a federal United States of Indonesia to a unitary Republic. But whereas the national political development was accentuated by the popular reaction against the Dutch-inspired character of the federal state, no such stimulus has urged the churches (many of which are newly organized) to achieve the stated purpose of the Indonesian Council of Churches. The move within the Chinese church bodies is toward division rather than toward unification. Member churches of the National Council generally do not appear willing to divest themselves of the sovereignty so recently acquired, by merging into a national church body. Many of them still are too preoccupied with the problems of survival and with local and regional matters.

While the miracle of a united church is still not in sight, during the three years of the Council's existence it has won a place for itself in the life and programs of the constituent churches in the following ways:

1. The National Missionary Commission of the Council of Churches is replacing the voluntarily dissolved Missions Consulate as the liaison agency between churches and European missions and as the central business office of the missionary agencies, even as the Council of Churches has replaced the Missions Consulate as the representative of the churches in dealing with the government ministries and departments in all official matters.

2. The church bodies are tending to call upon the National Council of Churches for a variety of services. For instance, when one of the church bodies in mid-Celebes faced a difficult problem in its relations with the missionaries, the General Secretary of the Council of Churches was called upon to mediate between them. A number of church bodies and congregations, desiring aid from the central government or foreign missions boards and ecumenical organizations, have requested the Council of Churches to mediate on their behalf or at least to support their pleas for aid.

3. The Theological Commission of the National Council of Churches called a consultation of theological schools in January, 1952, which resulted in agreements between the nine middle-grade theological schools, as well as the three other theological training institutions represented. They agreed to adopt a common standard of theological education, admission requirements, and curriculum. They also worked out a scheme for producing needed theological texts in the Indonesian language.

4. Regional and local Councils of Churches have developed in a number of areas, which operate regionally and locally along cooperative lines.

5. The Commission on Church and State regularly advises with Protestant members in Parliament and Cabinet Ministers concerning the wishes and point of view of the churches. In 1950 when the draft Constitution threatened a curtailment of religious liberty, the Commission protested with the result that the offending clause was revised. In 1952 when Moslems forcibly detained some Protestants and sought to force them to recant their faith, the Commission was among the Christian agencies which took the initiative to protect the rights of the Protestants.

6. The Commission on Religious Education keeps watch over provisions of religious education in the schools. When in 1951 the Ministry of Religions decreed that the government intended to determine policy and administer the program of religious instruction, the Council of Churches protested that this was the responsibility of the churches. As a consequence the offending decree was revised, returning responsibility for determining curricular materials and choice of teachers to the churches. The Roman Catholics joined with the Protestants in this action.

7. A special commission is cooperating with the government in the drafting of a law concerning marriage. The formula when ready will be presented to Parliament for adoption.

8. The Council of Churches has initiated requests to ecumenical organizations in Australia and the United States on behalf of the member churches and union agencies for relief and aid.

9. For years the Missions Consulate was the mail address of the International Missionary Council in its activities in Indonesia, particularly in postwar years in the administration of orphaned Missions. But at the Willingen meeting of the International Missionary Council, in 1952, the Council of Churches was affiliated to the I.M.C. as the Indonesian member, and the three delegates of the Indonesian Council seated.

V. CHURCH-MISSION RELATIONSHIPS

The so-called "Independent Foreign Policy" is the prism through which every event and idea is refracted and analyzed in Indonesia today. Directly and indirectly, the attitudes inherent in this policy obtain in the ecclesiastical world as well as in the political.

The Sukiman cabinet fell in the spring of 1952 because the signing of the Mutual Security Agreement with the United States was regarded as a violation of the nation's independent foreign policy. The San Francisco Treaty is still awaiting ratification (or rejection) for the same reason. Any Asian land not on the New Delhi-Rangoon-Djakarta axis is suspect.

All Southeast Asia is understandably sensitive with respect to imperialism and colonialism; Indonesia is especially so. Any gift from a foreign source is eyed with suspicion, lest there be strings attached. Some churchmen feel that to accept gifts from a predominantly Moslem Indonesian government is preferable to receiving contributions from Christian sources which are foreign.

In most mission lands, the devolution of responsibility from mission to church has been gradual. Relatively speaking, that process was retarded in Indonesia prior to the coming of the Japanese. The missionaries were working within a framework of paternalism, political, economic and ecclesiastical, which did not permit the substantial transfer of authority to nationals. During the Japanese occupation, the churches in a day were required to learn to do for themselves what they should have been learning over decades. With the restoration of peace and the proclamation of the Republic, the European missions agencies discovered that they could return to Indonesia only as guests.

But guests must be invited, and many of the church bodies were in no mood to invite the white man, who was a reminder of more than three centuries of colonialism. Even among those church bodies which may have been so minded, there was implicit or explicit social pressure not to bring the Westerner back into the active life of an Indonesian institution. However, the mood is changing slowly but surely as the Indonesian church bodies recognize the need and advantages of maintaining relations with foreign church agencies.

The large Batak Church has entered into relations with the Lutheran World Federation, whereby it receives monetary grants and personnel. The two major Dutch societies at Oegstgeest and Baarn have sent limited numbers of missionaries to work on Java and in certain of the prewar mission fields of Eastern Indonesia. The Basle Mission has Swiss workers in Kalimantan (Indonesian Borneo). The three branches of the "Protestant Church" in Eastern Indonesia, and the Synod of Bali, have requested personnel and monetary assistance from mission agencies in the United States. This invited personnel is primarily of a technical character, to be assigned to theological education and leadership training, writing and publication, translation, agricultural reconstruction, and administration.

There are a few places in which missionary assistance is wanted for preaching. The Church of Bali has on its staff a Dutch theological teacher, and has requested from America a doctor to open a maternity home in the village where the church headquarters is located. When a New York

representative urged the Synod leaders to invite evangelistic workers, they replied politely but firmly that this was impossible. Likewise in West Java, where Islam is especially intransigent, a guardian punished his ward for attending a Sunday school conducted in the home of an American missionary, not just because it was Christian, but because it was "a foreign religion."

One of the justifications for the National Missionary Commission (of the Council of Churches) is to assist in the adjustment of relations between the autonomous church bodies and the foreign sending societies. The Council of Churches is composed exclusively of church bodies having their locus and place of operation in Indonesia (though they include Chinese church bodies and Dutch congregations as well as Indonesian). As both indigenous churches and missionaries may feel called to proclaim the gospel, possibly in the same area, tension will arise unless a proper relationship is established. The National Missionary Commission seeks to alleviate tensions at such points.

American sectarian personnel and resources are much more in evidence than those of the traditional churches. The Assemblies of God (Springfield, Missouri) have enlarged their American staff in Minahasa (already ninety per cent Protestant) and in Amboin (fifty per cent Protestant), and operate a seagoing vessel for inter-island visits. The Jehovah's Witnesses, Seventh-Day Adventists, and various Pentecostal groups are expanding their staffs, largely because of resources released by the closing of China. They are concentrating primarily on Java and in areas with strong Christian communities. In Indonesia, as elsewhere, the sects find it easier to convert Christians to their particular bias than to preach the gospel in the untouched areas. Southern Baptist Convention ex-China missionaries are located in several cities on Java organizing institutions and congregations. The Christian and Missionary Alliance, with a predominantly American staff, has been engaged in sacrificial pioneer work in Indonesian Borneo for a quarter-century.

Indonesian Christianity hitherto has escaped denominationalism by the operation of a colonial law which limited one missionary agency to a given area. These now autonomous churches are perplexed by the relative inability of cooperative American churches to supply needed resources, whereas noncooperative American groups are seemingly opulent.

Vis-a-vis European church bodies, the Indonesian problem is to employ missionaries who come wanting to work inside the church structure. The American representatives of societies that have entered Indonesia recently operate outside the existing church framework, use methods and preach

doctrines strange to Indonesian Christians. Confronted with a revitalized Islam, Indonesian Christians are anxious lest dissent develop within the Christian community at a moment when Christians should be united and alert in the struggle to preserve the right to preach the gospel, and even to exist.

VI. THE CHINESE CHURCHES

The Chinese Churches, like the Chinese people with Indonesian citizenship, generally are distinct from the bulk of Indonesian churches. Mr. The Pek Siong, Chairman of the Association of Indonesian Citizens of Chinese Origin, complained to the Office of Minorities in Surabaya, on Java, (June 9, 1953) of discriminatory regulations against citizens of Chinese ancestry. He expressed the wish on behalf of the minority he represented that there might be but one kind of Indonesian citizen.

The differences to which reference is made derive from a number of factors, many of which condition the relations within the churches also. The Chinese immigrant and his children, even those of mixed parentage, generally remain unassimilated into Indonesian society. Due to industry, the practice of thrift, and a commercial sense, much of the business life of the nation is controlled by Chinese to their economic advantage. The disparity of wealth, of the availability of education, quality of housing, etc., accentuates the differences between Indonesians and Indonesian-Chinese.

These conditions are less true in the predominantly Christian areas of Minahasa and Ambon than in the Moslem areas. Old Minahasa families with Chinese names regard themselves and are regarded by their neighbors as 100 per cent Indonesian. In both these areas Christians of Chinese origin have told the writer that they "feel" Indonesian. Yet they have their own segregated congregations, and one of the Indonesian ministers has confessed to us that though the Christian Chinese are his parish responsibility, he does not know how to minister to them.

The superior economic position of the Chinese community means that the congregations have fewer economic problems. The disregard for expense with which many of them build their homes is seen also in their churches. The Chinese church structures are substantial and even ornate. Because the congregations are large, and generally growing, the salary of ministers tends to be adequate, whereas the average Indonesian minister is considerably underpaid.

Five Chinese church bodies are found on Java. They originated variously from the missionary activities of the Dutch Reformed Church, the (American) Methodist Church, the Mennonites, and Indonesia churches.

Dutch missionaries are attached to some of these church bodies. Organized as the National Council of Chinese Churches, with a paid Executive Secretary in Djakarta, they issue a monthly magazine in Chinese and Indonesian language editions. In addition to these five ecumenical bodies, numerous sectarian Chinese congregations are on Java and the other islands.

The Chinese churches generally are zealously evangelical, especially those which derive from Methodist, Pentecostal, and China-Chinese efforts. The Chinese in Indonesia have been responsive to the Christian gospel in larger proportion than their relatives in China. They are relatively rootless and insecure, and the communization of China has presented them with the alternative between Marxian or Christian ideology.

When the cooperative program for Indonesia was projected in 1950 by the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., Division of Foreign Missions, these islands were seen as a place to which ex-China personnel could be assigned to advantage. But the entry of China into the Korean War made all Americans *persona non grata* with the Chinese communities, which, because Indonesia has recognized Peking, are predominantly pro-Peking. Thus the Chinese churches were unable to invite American missionaries to Indonesia, and none have come for that purpose. The American societies that are committed to work with the National Council of Churches in Indonesia can assign personnel only when it has been invited; the Chinese church bodies dare not invite, lest they be accused of being pro-American. But mission societies which were not committed to work with the ecumenical church bodies, such as the Southern Baptists, were not handicapped by lack of invitations. Thus they have been able to send in missionary staff which has met with a welcome response from many of the Chinese congregations. This paradox within the ecumenical movement cannot be easily resolved.

VII. CONCLUSION

"Operation bootstrap" is now twelve years old. The Indonesian Christian community has demonstrated its capacity to support the church, to govern itself, and to organize and operate nation-wide and region-wide union and ecumenical institutions. The Indonesian churches have not undertaken serious evangelistic efforts in non-evangelized areas. Survival within their own geographical limits is still too pressing.

The Indonesian Christian community therefore welcomes outside agencies which undertake evangelistic responsibilities in untouched areas. The National Missionary Commission has been organized by the Indonesian

Council of Churches to negotiate with foreign churches and missionary societies to this end. The China Inland Mission recently has assigned staff to west Borneo, after extended consultations with Indonesian Christian bodies. The door is open to other outside agencies on a similar basis.

Ecumenical and union institutions, and some of the regional church bodies, have invited foreign personnel and foreign contributions to supplement what they seek to do for themselves. The United Church of Christ in the Philippines has assigned a theological teacher, the International Committee of the Y.M.C.A. a fraternal secretary, two American mission boards have missionaries in Indonesia (and several others are seriously considering invitations), cooperating in a program of ecumenical assistance directed by the Indonesian Council of Churches. Seven American boards and churches are contributing financially. Limited contributions have come from ecumenical organizations in Australia, Great Britain, Sweden, and the United States.

The Far Eastern Joint Office of the Division of Foreign Missions, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., is the body representing the American agencies in this cooperative program. Theological training facilities have been enlarged and strengthened. Material stimulus to the establishment of a Christian University led to its inauguration, October 15, 1953. The program of Christian literature production has been accelerated. Indonesian Christian leaders have been and are now being trained in American universities, as well as in Europe.

Resources available for the interdenominational undergirding of this Asian Christian community have been minute compared with those allocated for projects bearing the denominational label. The neglected opportunities, the retreats in the face of non-Christian religions and varieties of imperialistic Christianity, can be attributed in part to the divided character of American Protestantism, its lack on the policy-making level of a comprehensive world view and strategy, and its inability to marshal its forces at focal points of need and opportunity. Wealthy enough to provide jacks—or even atomic boosters—to supplement the Indonesian self-lifting operation, the American churches are barely providing the lift-straps. The time is still not too late for American missionary strategists to avail themselves of the Indonesian proving ground, as a setting in which to develop techniques and approaches for switching from a mission-centered to a church-centered program of foreign assistance.

Clarence Tucker Craig, 1895-1953

LUTHER A. WEIGLE

ABOUT THIRTY YEARS AGO, one of the most distinguished New Testament scholars, Ernest Dewitt Burton, crowned his career with two years of remarkably effective service as president of the University of Chicago. After his death, the faculty and alumni of that institution spoke often of "the glorious two years" of his presidency. Said one: "During the glorious two years of Dr. Burton's presidency every word which came from the University seemed filled with a certain spiritual quality which elicited from the alumnus an answering warmth."

You in this Seminary have had a similar experience. One of the foremost New Testament scholars of our time accepted the deanship of this Seminary, only to be cut down in the height of his powers after four years of service. But I am sure that these years will live in your memories and in the annals of this institution as "the glorious four years" of Dr. Craig's deanship.

Clarence Tucker Craig was richly equipped in personality, training, and experience for the administrative leadership which he here assumed in 1949. A year of teaching in China, following graduation from college, gave him a firsthand sense of the problems and opportunities of the Christian missionary. His three years of education for the ministry at the Boston University School of Theology led to the award of its highest honor, the Jacob Sleeper Fellowship. Under the terms of this fellowship, he engaged in graduate study at Harvard, at Basle in Switzerland, and at Berlin in Germany, as well as at Boston University, from which he received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. He had eight years of experience in the pastorate before becoming Professor of New Testament Language and Literature at the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology. After eighteen years of teaching at Oberlin, he accepted the invitation to a professorship of New Testament at Yale, where he served with distinction for three years, until he was called to the deanship at Drew.

CLARENCE TUCKER CRAIG, Ph.D., D.Litt., was a highly valued member of the Editorial Board of *RELIGION IN LIFE*.

LUTHER A. WEIGLE, Ph.D., S.T.D., LL.D., Dean Emeritus of Yale Divinity School, is Chairman of the Standard Bible Committee, New Haven, Connecticut. He delivered the above address at Drew Theological Seminary at the service of dedication of the Seminary Chapel as "Craig Chapel," on Feb. 17, 1954.

My personal acquaintance with Professor Craig began in 1938, when he was chosen to be one of the New Testament scholars upon the Committee charged with the revision of the English translation of the Bible. I voted for him with a slight measure of misgiving, for I was strongly opposed to the extreme "thorough-going" apocalypticism of Albert Schweitzer, and someone had told me that Craig was in Schweitzer's camp. That misgiving was quickly dissipated. He was not a devotee of the extreme view which I distrusted. The breadth and depth, the objectivity, poise, and soundness of his scholarship were manifest at the first meeting he attended, and were increasingly revealed throughout our years of working together in preparation of the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament.

The New Testament Section of the Standard Bible Committee was a group of men well fitted for their high task. There was James Moffatt, Presbyterian, scholar and saint, whose wide learning and prior experience in the translation of the New Testament were resources of inestimable value; Edgar Goodspeed, Baptist, accomplished linguist and man of letters, lifelong student and teacher of Greek, who also had made a modern translation of the New Testament; Henry Cadbury, Quaker, as saintly as the first of his colleagues, as expert in the Greek language as the second, and an eager seeker for the truth who would not permit us to let any question pass unexplored; Frederick Grant, Protestant Episcopal, historian, exegete and theologian, a careful textual student of the ancient manuscripts of the Greek New Testament; Millar Burrows, Congregational, a biblical scholar who is as thoroughly at home in the Old Testament as in the New Testament, in Semitics as in Greek, and in archeology as in language; Walter Russell Bowie, Protestant Episcopal, preacher, pastor, teacher of homiletics, and a writer of impeccable English prose; Abdel Wentz, Lutheran, church historian, staunch defender of the Reformation faith and of the right of the people to the Word of God in language that they can understand. I refrain from characterizing myself, and simply state for the record that I was a member of this Section and its chairman as well as chairman of the Committee.

In this rare company Clarence Tucker Craig, Methodist, was the youngest of the group. But his work justified his place from the beginning, and no one among us commanded more respect and confidence than he did throughout the nine years of our study of the Greek text and face-to-face discussion of its meaning and translation.

I ask you now to think with me of three primary aspects of Dean

Craig's life and work, of his contribution to (1) theological education; (2) the ecumenical movement; (3) the Revised Standard Version of the Bible.

I

Tucker Craig's decision to devote his life to New Testament scholarship and to theological education is evidenced by the rigorous and well-balanced program of graduate study which he undertook upon completing the B.D. course at Boston. One is tempted to speculate as to what The Methodist Church missed, in that he was not called to the faculty of one of its own seminaries as soon as that graduate work was crowned by his doctorate. But such speculation is idle. It was Oberlin that afforded him the opportunity to proceed with the service in theological education to which God had surely called him. At Oberlin he was a tower of strength to the institution; and his eighteen years there were years of steady, substantial growth in experience, in influence, and into assured high standing among New Testament scholars and teachers.

When, in 1946, the opportunity was afforded to add a full professor of New Testament to the faculty of the Yale University Divinity School, and I was authorized by the President of the University to secure the best man in sight, Professor Burrows and I did not long hesitate over the problem of whom we wanted. There was general agreement, when we proposed his name, that Craig was the man. To our joy, when I approached him, his answer was affirmative.

That decision was significant of his strong sense of vocation, for a reason that I learned only later. The president of a liberal arts college had made him an alluring offer at this same time. This president had been given a special endowment, with which he was to add to the faculty of his institution a few scholars of unquestioned distinction, paying them salaries much higher than its normal scale for full professors—indeed, much higher than we could offer at Yale. These men would carry only a light teaching schedule, and would have ample time for scholarly research and publication; their function would be to add prestige to the institution and raise its general standards. He invited Professor Craig to accept one of these lifelong appointments. That was a temptation! But Craig answered No. His place in the world, he was clear, was not only in the field of New Testament scholarship, but in theological education.

He is remembered at Yale with gratitude and affection. His work as teacher and as counselor of graduate students fulfilled our hopes in welcoming him to the Yale faculty. When the call came to the deanship

of Drew Theological Seminary, he discussed it fully and frankly with me. I asked him if there was anything I could do to afford him an ampler opportunity at Yale, but he answered that his decision would be based, not on conditions at Yale, but at Drew. In the end, he told me, it was determined by two major considerations: he welcomed the call to administrative service and the opportunity to render that service in the interest of theological education under the auspices of The Methodist Church.

You will remember that he set forth his basic ideals for this institution in an address delivered at the Founders Day Convocation of Drew University, October 13, 1949, entitled "Methodist Emphases in Theological Education." It is a notable utterance, clear, forthright, and profoundly true. It was published in the *Drew University Bulletin* for November of that year. I hope that sufficient copies were printed to be still available for students as they begin their work here. In fact I can think of no better way to commemorate this present occasion than to reprint that address and to let him, through it, speak to us again.

I was tempted to try to give you an outline of its content. But that would be a mistake. It is too meaty, too comprehensive and compact, to lend itself to that procedure. Let me instead quote just two passages of outstanding significance. It is well that he should speak to us himself this evening.

The first is concerning the aim of a Methodist theological seminary: "I assume that a Methodist Theological School is not a sectarian institution. It does not exist to propagate denominationalism or to perpetuate the sin of a divided Christendom. It is a school supported by Methodists in carrying out their share of the responsibility to provide ministers for the whole church. Furthermore, it should be a school where Methodist emphases receive a central place. We are under no illusions that these emphases are entirely peculiar to us or that they would be rejected by most Christians. Therefore all who desire training for the Christian ministry are welcome."

The second passage is concerned with doctrine: "We have been passing through a time when the doctrine of man has received major attention. A reaction was bound to come to the shallow optimism of an age which had found the Christian belief in the sinfulness of man an impossible offense to his egoism. Not only was biblical religion clear upon the extent to which man fell short of the glory of God. Empirical investigation by scientific workers and the contemporary evidence of the bestial possibilities in man joined to dispel romantic illusions about the inherent goodness of human

nature. But that work has been done. If I may say so, it has been overdone. When books now appear from the pen of those who led this revolution in Christian thinking, they contain little but stale repetition about the ambiguities of our human situation and further analyses of the involvement of men in a sinful society. Reading these, one is inevitably led to the impression that the final word of our religion must be, 'Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?'

"I do not want to caricature the helpful work of any great thinker. But I do think it is high time for the Christian Church to answer this pivotal question: Does our faith offer men simply a truer insight into the human predicament, or does it offer a realizable redemption to those who live amid this predicament? There can be no doubt about the New Testament position. Here stands the confident assurance that in Christ God has reconciled men to himself so that peace is now possible, even though there are limitations of human experience not yet removed. Do we no longer believe this, or is it the obligation of those who inherit the Methodist tradition to lift up by word and by deed this truth which is so badly needed today? An emphasis upon the reality of the redeemed life should be central in any Methodist seminary."

II

While yet at Oberlin, Professor Craig made a substantial contribution to the American sector of the ecumenical movement in the field of Christian religious education. He was elected by the Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church as one of its representatives on the International Council of Religious Education, in which were associated the educational boards of more than forty major Protestant denominations. He accepted this appointment in no merely formal fashion, and became one of the active, dependable, working members of that Council and of those of its committees to which he was assigned. He stood on no assumed dignity as a theological professor, he claimed no personal authority because his field of scholarship was the Word of God; he simply got down to our common tasks with the rest of us, making available the rich resources of his knowledge of the Scriptures and his rare ability as a teacher.

I remember vividly how we turned to him some eight years ago, when it seemed as though a major Commission appointed to make a re-appraisal of the Council's total enterprise would be unable to resolve its inner conflicts in theology and in the philosophy of education. The officers of the Council and of the Commission asked Craig, who had been present in all

the discussions, to undertake alone the drafting of the section of the report dealing with "Theological and Educational Foundations." At the cost of the postponement of other work, he undertook this responsibility, and prepared a draft which was accepted with a minimum of amendment. Looking over our correspondence, I find that I wrote to him later: "We are more grateful that we can well express for the way that you responded to our call and came to our help in the matter of the Study of Christian Education. Your willingness to shoulder the burden of preparing the paper on theological and educational foundations rescued that study from imminent shipwreck."

Dr. Craig was one of the delegates of The Methodist Church at the meeting in Amsterdam which organized the World Council of Churches. He had been interested before that meeting in some of the study processes undertaken in preparation for it; and after the Amsterdam meeting he found himself fully engaged in the movement. This is recent history, with which you are acquainted and in which you take pride. There is no need for me to list the duties he accepted, the meetings he attended, and what he wrote and published, in the interest of our world-wide oneness in Christ. He was elected Chairman of the American Theological Committee of the Commission on Faith and Order, and when he went to the hospital in his last illness he was obliged to cancel a scheduled trip to Geneva to attend a Committee meeting in preparation for the sessions of the World Council of Churches to be held in Evanston this year. Dean Craig held rightful place among the most far-seeing of the Christian scholars and ministers and statesmen of the world today. We of Yale rejoice with you in recognition of the significant part that he has had in the Christian ecumenical movement of our time.

III

The Revised Standard Version of the Bible is not a collection of individual revisions of the various books of the Bible. Like the King James Version itself, and like the English and American revision of 1881-1901, it was prepared by the slow, thorough method of face-to-face conference and discussion. Every decision was reached, every word hammered out, by this procedure of free debate and final vote of the group. It is therefore impossible to say of any part of the Revised Standard Version, "This is the work of Moffatt," or "This is Goodspeed's," or "This is Craig's." The initial drafts of various books were made by individuals; but every draft was so changed in the course of discussion as to make it a part of the whole for which the Committee, rather than any individual, is responsible.

Yet much depended upon the adequacy of the initial drafts; and it is only fair to say that Craig's work was so well done as to require a minimum of overhauling and recasting in Committee sessions. It is generally agreed, I think, that the Revised Standard Version is especially helpful in its rendering of the Epistles of the New Testament, particularly those by Paul. You will be glad to know that Craig prepared the initial drafts of 1 Corinthians and of Hebrews, and that both of these books have been among the most highly commended by reviewers.

For example, the author of the excellent review in *The Times Literary Supplement*, London, May 24, 1947, selected 1 Corinthians 7 for special comment: "The passages in the Epistle which deal with sexual morality are especially striking: by a judicious use of current terms . . . the translators have managed to make 1 Corinthians 7 read like a chapter of sound common sense instead of the cento of out-of-date maxims which so many Christians are apt to think it, largely because our existing versions have done St. Paul far less than justice."

Dean Craig's last major publication was the Introduction and Exegesis for 1 Corinthians, in Volume 9 of *The Interpreter's Bible*. In preparation for this address, I read it through on successive evenings, so that I might recall the more fully our committee discussions and recapture the spirit that he brought to them. That reading was a memorable experience, not only for what it recalled, but even more for its revelation of the author's competence as a biblical scholar and interpreter. I venture the prophecy that the Introduction and Exegesis for 1 Corinthians will be generally recognized, when the publication of *The Interpreter's Bible* is completed, as one of the high lights of that great work. I wish, indeed, that this contribution by Dean Craig might be published separately, in a volume bearing his name, so that it might reach a wider circle of Bible readers and students who cannot be expected to procure the twelve-volume work. Such a separate publication would be a most appropriate memorial to him.

We cannot but mourn his death; we cannot but wish that he could have had twenty years more of service here. There is an empty place on the horizon, as though a great tree had fallen. And there is sadness in our hearts, for a wonderful friend and a great teacher and leader has gone from among us. Yet sadness is not our dominant mood at this service of commemoration. We rejoice, rather, in all that he was and did. We lift our hearts to God in gratitude for him, and we join in the high resolve that the work to which he gave himself so unreservedly shall not fail for want of men or money to carry on to the fulfillment of his hopes.

Book Reviews

Apostles of Discord. By RALPH LORD ROY. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1953. xii-437 pp. \$3.75.

Here is a careful, documented research on subversive movements within Protestantism. Originating as a doctor's thesis by a graduate student at Union Theological Seminary, the book has been printed for popular consumption and gives evidence of becoming the widest read and most controversial publication of the year. It gives a picture of the groups and movements which corrupt the Christian faith by uncritically identifying it with political movements of either the extreme right or the extreme left. It deals with "hate sects," bigots and scoundrels who hide behind the façade of piety or patriotism.

For one who will understand the strange crosscurrents within Protestantism today and the amazing attacks on the Ecumenical Movement, the great denominations and their leaders, this book is required reading. Its complete index makes it a valuable reference source. For example, what is the attitude of Carl McIntire toward Billy Graham? The index refers the reader to page 224.

Ralph Lord Roy, an ordained Methodist minister, is an extraordinarily well-informed young man. He is possessed of a keen eye, an attentive ear, indefatigable energy for research, and a clear, analytical mind. I was counsel for Bishop Oxnam when the Bishop testified before the House un-American Activities Committee. Just as the hearing started five men came into the crowded hearing room from a private door and took seats in the front row which had been reserved for them by Representative Jackson of California. The press, and we, were curious, particularly when the five refused to divulge their names; and they might have remained incognito except for young Pastor Roy who was present and who for the press identified them as representatives of the American Council of Churches, giving their names and, for good measure, their titles and addresses.

His volume is divided into two parts: Part I: "The Ministry of Hate," with chapters such as "The Protestant Underworld vs. Dwight D. Eisenhower," "Hitler's Ghost in American Garb," and "No Popery!"—Bigotry's Battlecry." Part II: "The Ministry of Disruption," with such chapters as "Saboteurs of Protestant Cooperation," "The Hammer and Sickle Behind the Cross," "The Struggle Within Methodism," and "Denominational Dilemmas." Not pleasant reading this; but essential to an understanding of the days in which we live.

The author has performed a great and a timely service. He has given a factual presentation of persons operating on the fringes of Protestantism and brought their work into proper perspective. Sometimes the attacks on the cooperative efforts of the churches are direct and outspoken, as, for example, the following outburst by a southern "evangelist":

"The Federal Council is a Goliath of power, a wild Absalom of rebellion, a loathsome Judas of treachery, a deceiving Sapphira of falsehood, a cruel Ahab of covetousness, a bold Belshazzar of irreverence, a merciless Nero of evil, a haughty Nebuchadnezzar of pride, and a painted Jezebel of murder. . . . I ask you again, will we tolerate such? I say a thousand times, NO, and again I say BY THE GRACE OF GOD, THEY SHALL BE EXTERMINATED!"

Sometimes the attacks are more subtle, as when a group of such persons as those described in the book secure and file with the House Committee on un-American Activities petitions demanding that the Committee undertake an investigation of the Protestant clergy. Sometimes there are studied attempts at confusion, as when organizations with similar-sounding names are organized and meetings of the newly formed organizations are called at places and times to conflict with and hamper the work of the established groups. All these techniques, some blatant, some quite subtle, are clearly explained and exposed.

Many a reader of current literature is today left confused on particular organizations or publications as the result of vicious attacks and spirited defenses. "Protestants and Other Americans United"—can it be classed as fair or unfair? "Christ's Mission, Inc."—a real movement of the Reformation or merely a refuge for bigots? In his chapter on these and other controversial organizations the author demonstrates his ability to marshal facts and material and to make cool and careful analysis and appraisal. I am happy that young Roy is heading for the ministry, but he has the makings of a top-flight lawyer.

One of the book's greatest contributions is the study of groups within Protestantism working at the opposite ends of the economic order—the extreme liberal and the extreme conservative. These are listed, identified, and their work explained. In general, these are the groups which seek to have the church espouse or identify itself with an economic system. These are not the "apostles of discord" or hater-mongers or destroyers of the denomination, but in many cases are substantial supporters of the larger communions.

On the left, we have such controversial characters as the Melishes, father and son. The younger Melish's affinity for radical organizations brought about one of the most publicized church litigations of our times and all but demolished the Church of the Holy Trinity in Brooklyn where he served as assistant rector to his father. Having ridden out the storm and litigation and still serving his parish, his published sermons, radiant in the Christian hope, and his outstanding work in race relations and among the underprivileged give indication that he may yet establish for himself a place of high esteem in his own denomination and the church at large.

On the right we have a review of what the author terms the "clergy-oriented bastions of unrestrained individualism"—Rev. James W. Fifield of Los Angeles with his "Spiritual Mobilization" and Howard E. Kershner with his "Christian Freedom Foundation." In the section dealing with the projects of these and similar organizations one finds the names of "conservative" preachers—Daniel K. Poling, Norman Vincent Peale, Henry Darlington, Samuel M. Shoemaker—and some "conservative" tycoons of big business—J. Howard Pew (Sun Oil) and Jasper Crane (DuPont). But one also finds the names of many of the middle-of-the-roaders—Harold E. Stassen, Charles P. Taft, Charles E. Wilson, Bishop Oxnam.

As is to be expected, the exposé of the "hate" groups has been widely and roundly complimented. Most of the criticism of the book is focused on the handling of these other economic groups. I have read criticisms on both sides, on the one hand indicating that the author has been too hard on the liberal elements and on the other hand that he has been unfair to the conservatives. Just as the Senate Investigating Committee found it difficult to find a counsel who was absolutely unbiased toward McCarthy and McCarthyism, so I suppose it is difficult to find a person absolutely unbiased in this field of economic thought. More than thirty years as a Wall Street lawyer, working in the field of finance and banking, gives me a natural

feeling of kinship to the conservative wing; so if I were forced to choose I would say the author tends to be too easy on the liberal wing and too rough with the conservative. Please note that this is only if I am forced to choose! I think the author has given a fair exposition of both elements.

The timing of the book is good. In August, 1954, the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches will meet at Evanston, Illinois. This is the first such gathering on American soil; and if at six-year intervals the Assembly meets, say, in England, Germany, one of the Scandinavian countries, India, Switzerland, Japan, somewhere south of the equator, then Canada, then Holland again, it will mean that this is the only time in our generation that our nation will be the host. The press, church and secular, are aware of the important chapter of church history which this great Second Assembly will write. But now the apostles of discord are coming into action. A "rival" meeting has been scheduled for Philadelphia just prior to the Evanston dates. Certain periodicals are stepping up the tempo of their vitriolic attacks on the World Council of Churches and its leadership. Derogatory materials are being supplied to American Legion Posts and vigilante groups. Some of these attacks are easily identified and understood, but some are more subtle and better disguised. In the months immediately preceding and during the weeks of the Assembly itself, how can one identify and appraise these criticisms and attacks? The best preparation is to read *Apostles of Discord* and to keep it as a handy reference source.

Apostles of Discord is a disturbing, thought-provoking, documented survey of the activities of menacing fringe groups that plague organized Protestantism, sowing seeds of hate and suspicion and attempting to sabotage the ecumenical movement and to incite hostility between Negro and white, Jew and Gentile, Catholic and Protestant. And these activities in the name of Him who taught that one should love his neighbor! Every pastor and every lay worker in the church will, in my opinion, be better oriented and better prepared for the tasks of today if he has read Ralph Lord Roy's book.

CHARLES C. PARLIN

Shearman & Sterling & Wright, 20 Exchange Place, New York City.

The Fulness of Time. By JOHN MARSH. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953. ix-189 pp. \$3.00.

This is a notable volume on an unusually significant theme. "Time," remarks Professor Marsh, "is perhaps the focal, as it is certainly a pressing, problem of our age." Possibly Christians are more conscious of this fact at the moment—and indeed at all times—than others are: the very title of the present volume is couched in scriptural terms which others than Christians would scarcely appreciate. Nonetheless for a generation we have seen philosophies of history emerge from the press, written by Christians and non-Christians alike. Names like those of Oswald Spengler, John MacMurray, Arnold Toynbee, Oscar Cullmann, and C. H. Dodd may, not without reason, be linked together. For from varying points of view they are all engaged in unraveling the tangled skein of history and exposing to view the logic of events which would appear to be leading to some conclusion—divine or otherwise. Lord Tennyson was somewhat of a pioneer in the same field in writing:

"For I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs,

And the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns."

Cullmann, Dodd, and now Marsh would at any rate agree on the poet's "one

increasing purpose"—a purpose which suggests that God acts in history to accomplish his will relative to man.

Dr. Marsh admittedly approaches the subject of an underlying philosophy (or better, theology) which would appear to form the *woof* upon which the *web* of history is woven, as a Christian theologian. Indeed, he further defines his view as that of the Reformed Theology, and he opens his discussion with several lengthy quotations from Calvin through which he establishes that for the Reformed faith the teaching of the Scriptures is normative (pp. 2ff). Professor Marsh professes himself as standing midstream in this tradition. Accordingly, he proposes in his book "on the basis of the religious insights of the Hebrew-Christian tradition, to formulate a sound philosophy of time, eternity, and history" (p. 17).

The author, in eight chapters which follow, performs a threefold task of great interest and moment for all who are concerned about the teaching of Scripture. These include the definition of such important words as the Hebrew 'eth and 'olam and the Greek *kairos*, *aion*, and *chronos*; the subsequent exegesis of numerous passages of Scripture in the light of these definitions; and finally the construction in some degree of a philosophy of history (the biblical one, to be sure) on the basis of these studies. Essentially, therefore, this volume is one in the realm of Biblical Theology, although in its conclusions and larger implications it leads on into and provides insights for those working in the field of Christian Philosophy. There is also an appendix on Oscar Cullman's *Christ and Time*—a book which covers the identical field—in which Professor Marsh breaks more than one lance with the Swiss scholar.

Professor Marsh adopts Weiser's suggestion that the Bible has *historicized* the myths of other literatures and religions and, therefore, "must be already possessed of a conception of history sufficiently self-conscious to account for such a remarkable adoption of a quite alien element" (p. 38). The question is then raised: whence this conception of history which was Israel's possession and which she employed as a criterion in dealing with, adopting, or rejecting the mythologies with which she came in contact? The answer is: "the Hebrew conception of history was inextricably bound up with the belief that God acted in it," and this belief she acquired first at the time of and in the course of experiencing the Exodus from Egypt (p. 42). Prophecy thus acquired a Name for God to which reference could be made in all succeeding ages—"I am the Lord, thy God, who brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." But she also acquired a criterion whereby to judge of the validity of all future prophecy—namely, this latter must always square with the revealed nature of the God of the Exodus, the God who acted with faithfulness and saving purpose in the affairs of history (pp. 68f).

This is a believing book. It takes the Scriptural materials seriously and at the same time exhibits a discriminating sense of what is and is not relevant to the Bible's central theme of the "gospel." I find myself very much in accord with Professor Marsh's major thesis and the great majority of his conclusions on vital topics. His view of the nature of Revelation as consisting in both an *Act* and a *Word* of God is, in my judgment, utterly essential to proper definition and doctrine at this point (pp. 23, 66ff). His distinction between Jewish (or Old Testament) apocalyptic and New Testament views relative to the doctrine of the "two ages (aions)" I find particularly helpful and accurate (pp. 140ff). His general rejection of Schweitzer's "consistent eschatology" follows a pattern popularized by Bultmann to some extent, but even more effectively by T. W. Manson and C. H. Dodd in

their separate ways, and one which the present reviewer finds most genial to his own thinking (p. 126). Also and perhaps above all, I cannot refrain from expressing my appreciation of his analysis of the "mind of the historic Jesus" relative to himself: Dr. Marsh believes that Jesus thought of himself in terms of his being the "anointed (Messiah) of the Lord" and the "Suffering Servant" (pp. 79ff).

In America, where the influence of Wrede and Bultmann has been so largely felt, I believe the major criticisms of this book will be that it pays too little attention on the one hand to Form Criticism, and on the other and accordingly, accepts too implicitly the Gospels' own assertions that Jesus thought thus and so about himself. "Psychologizing" of Jesus—that is, the endeavor to understand the nature of Jesus' self-awareness or of his so-called "messianic consciousness"—has not been widely popular among American scholars since the days of the above-mentioned German critics. For myself, I hold with Marsh and many another abroad who have not adopted this extreme position.

My own one severe criticism of his book concerns what appears to be almost an "aside," when he remarks that he cannot believe in Jesus "doing things to fulfil prophecies" (p. 97). But if one agrees—as Professor Marsh does—that Jesus knew what he was about at all times, and also that he knew the prophets at first hand in the Hebrew text, what alternative would he suggest to his "doing things to fulfil prophecies"? And in any case, why should he not have done so? One of the few insights which Schweitzer has given us that is, in my judgment, correct, is that on an occasion like the "Entry into Jerusalem" in Passion Week, our Lord was fulfilling Zech. 9:9 of intent to challenge the city to accept him! Would Professor Marsh not agree? To fulfil prophecy of intent is surely not to be opposed to "the natural and inevitable behaviour of one who conceives his destiny" in terms of prophecy, as the author seems to try to make out (p. 97)!

JOHN WICK BOWMAN

Professor of New Testament Interpretation, San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, California.

Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr. By OSCAR CULLMANN. Translated by Floyd V. Filson. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953. 252 pp. \$4.50.

The shelves of our theological libraries are crowded with scholarly volumes on the Apostle Paul. But Peter, despite his great importance for the life of the early Church, has not been treated in equally extensive fashion. F. J. Foakes-Jackson's *Peter, Prince of Apostles* (1927) is the outstanding but rather solitary exception to the above statement. It is therefore a satisfaction to welcome Filson's effective translation of Oscar Cullmann's *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr*.

Dr. Cullmann, in addition to his academic abilities, has the unusual distinction of teaching in two countries at once, being a Professor at the University of Basle and at the Ecole des Hautes-Études, Sorbonne, Paris. His ability to interpret New Testament historical problems so as to reveal their relevance for current theological discussion makes his writings significant to many who are not specialists in the field. He has had a wide circle of American readers since the translation of *Christ and Time*. This new book is readable as well as scholarly. The bibliographical references in the more than six hundred footnotes will assist the reader who wishes to follow the discussion further. The judiciously placed summaries will encourage any who become lost in the details. The recent archeological discoveries in Rome have created a new

interest in the subject of the book. Dr. Cullmann's extensive use of Roman Catholic scholarship should make his study of value outside the Protestant circle and may lessen the parochialism of those within.

The title given the entire book precisely summarizes the first of its two major sections. Its three chapters follow Peter through the three stages of his career. The Gospels present him as *disciple* and as the representative leader of the Twelve. The remaining New Testament reflects his career as *apostle*, first as head of the Jerusalem community and then as leader of the Jewish Christian Mission. Later tradition, Dr. Cullmann believes, is correct in affirming that he was a *martyr* at Rome, but there is no substantial evidence for an extended ministry there.

In this survey of Peter's career, judgment is expressed on numerous controversial issues: the Council of Acts 15 is that of Galatians 2 but Acts has placed the Decree too early in the narrative; I Peter may be only indirectly Petrine; Peter's theology was close to that of Paul and he was embarrassed by the intransigence of James; Peter stressed the atoning aspect of Jesus' death; Peter and Paul were the respective heads of the Jewish Christian Mission and the Gentile Christian Mission; Peter was probably executed in the Vatican district but his burial place is unknown; the recent excavations may have discovered the memorial monument referred to about A.D. 200 by the Roman presbyter Gaius.

The second half of the book is an exegetical and theological study of Matthew 16:17-20. Dr. Cullmann concludes that this passage is a genuine saying of Jesus, although it belongs in a different context, possibly that of Luke 22:31ff. He attacks a common Protestant interpretation that Peter's confession is the Rock on which the Church is to be built, and assigns that role to Peter himself. With equal vigor he insists that the position of Peter as Rock is his unique apostolic responsibility and that nothing in the passage justifies its application to his successors at Rome or elsewhere. The "apostolic" foundation of the Church continues to be effective, not through a succession of bishops, but through the apostolic witness contained in the New Testament. The need for the authority of the keys continues, but an exclusive claim to this authority by the Roman See cannot be justified. Historically Jerusalem has a better claim than Rome to be regarded as the center from which Peter exercised authority over the entire Church. But this is not important since the "principle of succession cannot be justified either from Scripture or from the history of the ancient Church" (p. 238). Apparently Dr. Cullmann feels that this authority of the keys is embodied in the entire Church rather than in any geographical or ecclesiastical segment.

This reviewer is still inclined to go against the trend and to deal with Matthew 16:17-20 with the scissors of literary-historical criticism. But assuming that the passage reflects a genuine saying of Jesus, the following questions may indicate aspects of the problem raised by Dr. Cullmann's exegesis. Is it possible to argue that the New Testament as apostolic witness continues the foundation function of Peter as the Rock? On exegetical grounds Cullmann has denied that the Rock saying can be transferred to the successors of Peter. But is it then legitimate to transfer its significance to his contemporaries, even though they were apostles? Does the shadowy figure of Peter behind the Gospel of Mark or the Petrine Epistles justify the position that these documents are truly Petrine and that they continue his function as the foundation Rock? Has Dr. Cullmann sufficiently weighed the fact that much of the New Testament is post-apostolic, and, by his own argument, excluded from the foundation function assigned Peter? Assuming that it is exegetically valid to

distinguish between the "once-for-all" character of Peter's function as the Rock and the contributing character of the authority of the keys, how is this authority to find concrete expression in the Christian community?

These questions are not intended as criticisms of Dr. Cullmann's careful and substantial contribution to the discussion of Matthew 16:17-20. Some of them will be asked by Roman Catholic scholars, others by those who share Dr. Cullmann's basic theological position but who are uncertain whether Matthew 16:17-20 can be made to support their position so completely. In any event they may serve to continue the discussion begun by his provocative study.

The first half of this book is a much-needed biography of the earliest leader of the Christian community. But the second half goes beyond biographical and historical interest to the problem of authority within the Church. The problem has acquired fresh significance through the renewed awareness that the Church, in its basic aspects, is a Divine Society and not merely a voluntary association for the confirmation of respectability. But if this Society is thus unique, if its essential nature is derived from beyond itself, then the problem of its authority and the forms through which that authority should find expression becomes urgent. Dr. Cullmann has dealt with a facet of this larger problem. A debt of gratitude is owed him for the historical and the theological contributions he has made.

HARVEY K. MCARTHUR

Professor of New Testament, The Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Connecticut.

The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. By C. H. DODD. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1953. xi-488 pp. \$8.00.

The publication of *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development* (1936) has proved to be a significant event in the present trend toward the discovery of a unified kerygma in the major New Testament writings. One might have anticipated from that book that Professor Dodd would bring his studies to a climax with a full-length interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, since his reading of the kerygma as "realized eschatology" (he calls this term "not altogether felicitous," see footnote, p. 447) pointed toward the Fourth Gospel. The present volume amply fulfills that anticipation, indeed surpasses it. This is one of the most important books in the field of New Testament studies in our time, and Professor Dodd has put all scholars deeply in his debt.

It is a book to live with, not one to be scanned or rapidly read. Believing that the Fourth Gospel is an integrated whole and that each episode and discourse is to be understood in the light of the author's purpose, Dr. Dodd has arranged his studies under three heads. Part I, "The Background," surveys relevant contemporary thinking in Early Christianity, the Hermetic literature, Hellenistic Judaism: Philo of Alexandria, Rabbinic Judaism, Gnosticism and Mandaism. Part II, "Leading Ideas," contains studies in Symbolism, Eternal Life, Knowledge of God, Truth, Faith, Union with God, Light, Glory, Judgment, Spirit, Messiah, Son of Man, Son of God, Logos. Part III, "Argument and Structure," follows the run of the writing "to see how it (the argument) is reflected in the structure" (p. 289). He finds that the Fourth Gospel falls into three parts: The Proem, consisting of Prologue and Testimony, chapter 1; The Book of Signs, chapters 2-12; The Book of the

Passion, including the Farewell Discourses, chapters 13-17, and the Passion Narrative, chapters 18-20, or 21, if the last chapter is not to be regarded as an appendix.

On the moot question of dislocations of the text it may be in order to quote, "I shall assume as a provisional working hypothesis that the present order is not fortuitous. . . . If the attempt to discover any intelligible thread of argument should fail, then we may be compelled to confess that we do not know how the work was originally intended to run. If on the other hand it should appear that the structure of the gospel as we have it has been shaped in most of its details by the ideas which seem to dominate the author's thought, then it would appear not improbable that we have his work before us substantially in the form which he designed" (pp. 289, 290). Dr. Dodd's studies confirm him in the second alternative.

Commentaries on the Fourth Gospel are on the whole unsatisfactory, and perhaps necessarily so, since each episode and discourse suffers from being isolated. The commentator has to choose between being too brief or too long. The arrangement of Dodd's book is probably the most useful treatment possible. In working with it one feels the want of a subject index, which may not have been feasible in the case of this book. The student will want to make his own as he works through the book.

Of many excellencies perhaps the penetrating discussion of the "mysticism" of the Fourth Gospel may be singled out (pp. 197-200). Professor Dodd recognizes the objections to the use of this word to characterize a writing that has no place for ecstasy and stresses believing that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God and the keeping of his commandments. On the other hand, we have the obvious emphasis on union with God. What kind of mysticism is this, if it may be called mysticism at all? He answers, "If now we are thinking in terms of union with God, is not love, as a matter of fact, the only kind of union *between persons* of which we can have any possible experience? . . . John says that this is in truth the kind of union with God given in the Christian religion. . . . Whether this should be called 'mysticism' I do not know." (pp. 199, 200.)

One may predict that discussion of the book will center around Dodd's thesis that "he (John) is thinking, in the first place, not so much of Christians who need a deeper theology, as of non-Christians who are concerned about eternal life and the way to it, and may be ready to follow the Christian way if this is presented to them in terms that are intelligibly related to their previous religious interests and experience" (p. 9). His background studies, notably in the *Hermetica*, document the prevalence of this type of thinking, although "without any substantial borrowing on one side or the other" (p. 53, a judgment made about the *Hermetica* but applicable to other contemporary types of thought). At the same time, Dodd appears to hold that two kinds of readers are aimed at. The allusions to and the cryptic presentations of the sacraments, for example, show that only Christians can understand fully the true depth of his thought. Thus John would appear to have a twofold purpose in mind, to deepen and confirm the Gospel for Christians and to present an apology to non-Christians.

To be sure, these groups of readers can be successfully assumed and it can be shown, as Dodd does, how John's materials would appeal to both groups. But does this accord with his view that this is a thoroughly integrated book? Is it not over-subtle? Would it not be a simpler statement of purpose to think of the prospective readers as Christians who come from the background indicated, and whose need is to relate their thought-world to the historic Jesus, his deeds, his words, his death

and resurrection, if they are to become in reality the Spirit-filled believers John deeply yearns for them to be? The view that the references to the sacraments are designedly cryptic for the above reason seems to the present reviewer an evasion of the problem rather than a satisfactory solution of it.

The appendix on "The Historical Aspect of the Fourth Gospel" (p. 444 ff.) is vital to the whole interpretation as revealing the author's essential position, and this too will certainly prove fruitful of debate.

ALEXANDER C. PURDY

Professor of New Testament, The Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Connecticut.

A Theology of the Living Church. By L. HAROLD DEWOLF. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953. 383 pp. \$5.00.

For some time ministers and theological students have been asking for a single-volume summary of theology similar to William Adams Brown's *Christian Theology in Outline* of another generation. In this work it appears that Professor DeWolf has set out to meet that request. Although not an outline of theology as such, the book does touch upon the major themes in Christian theology in a quick succession of brief and readable paragraphs.

The author regards the experience of the Christian community as the source of theology. Methodologically he seeks to discover, expound, and defend the implications of such experience. He thus places himself in the rationalist tradition. Revelation seen as any act of God's self-disclosure and faith as man's commitment of his will are both made subject to man's cognitive acceptance. After the opening section on the nature, task, scope, and limitations of theology, Professor DeWolf treats briefly the theistic evidences, though they are called "Evidences for Theism." Then follow sections on "The Bible," "God and the World," "Man," "Christ and Reconciliation," and "The Kingdom and the Church."

The Bible is a part of the record of "the experience of the Christian community," written by men who "had truth of . . . extraordinary importance to convey." The authority of the Bible is a concession to its worth made by "a reasonable man" (p. 83).

God's attributes are cited as Unity, Absoluteness, Power, Knowledge, Holiness, Righteousness, and Love. He is seen to be both transcendent and immanent, governing the world though not without limitations as witnessed in the fact of natural evil.

Man is seen more nearly in the Arminian than the Calvinist tradition. While man's sinfulness is recognized, sin is not regarded as a normal state. The divine image is detailed as "Spiritual Nature," "sense of moral obligation," "longing for union with God," and "aspiration to goodness." Belief in man's immortality is traced to the demands of value experience, obedience to God's commands, and the compensations which God assures. Of Christ both his humanity and his sonship to God are stressed.

Professor DeWolf is careful to avoid any truncating of the human soul, just as he is on guard against any view which compromises the divine nature of Christ. The work of Christ is treated as an ethical and personal effect upon men reconciling them to God. The Holy Spirit is held to be a "mode" under which the divine existence makes its appearance. Avoiding either the economic view of the Trinity

or any suggestion of tritheism, the one God is asserted to appear in three modes of revelation. Any connection with historically heretical modalisms is disclaimed.

The Kingdom is both a present reality and a future hope. Foundations for both contentions are traced to the Bible and experience. A distinction is carefully made between the spiritual church and the organized church. The former is a fellowship of those sharing in the living community of faith. "It is the real spiritual fellowship of all those persons who have committed themselves to the reign of God." The latter is that earthly establishment of relationship whose structure is discernible by the time the Gospels were written. The authority of the church in the face of divisions within church organization is investigated in the light of current ecumenical hopes. The symbolic and realistic views of the sacraments are searched for the Word of God in grace and power present in them.

The book suffers from the mechanical limitations of too little space for so many topics. Perhaps a complete systematic theology in a single volume is an impossibility. Within the limitations of the project Professor DeWolf has, however, covered a remarkable scope of theological consideration.

The attempt at construction of a positive Christological doctrine seems to this reviewer not to be as adequate as the author's analysis of the historic and contemporary discussion. The Christology proposed turns out to be a synthesis of Ritschl's "religious value," Schleiermacher's "conscious dependence," and a paraphrase of the Johannine prologue. The author warns against the identification of Christ with God, but it is difficult to find the distinction maintained between the Word and the Giver of the Word. The Word is held to be "the meaningful, creative, self-giving, self-revealing purpose of God," and, "There is no distinguishing between His purposive self-giving and Himself, for His meaningful, creative, self-giving purpose is Himself" (p. 252). The author does not make clear how the elements enumerated as essential for an adequate Christology are accommodated in this "reconstruction."

A further problem concerns the metaphysics implicit in certain viewpoints expressed. Where the Bible is considered, a "truth" is spoken of as if it were a reality beyond the writers and readers (p. 73). Where Christ and the Holy Spirit are regarded as modes of the divine being, the nature of the reality which is back of the appearances is not specifically expounded (p. 279). Where the divine judgment is affirmed some truths are mentioned as the bases of distinction. The metaphysical character or status of these truths is not evident. One gets the impression that there is an inarticulate Platonic idealism at work in the author's mind, yet when he describes the final realities they are of the nature of values. The reader cannot decide whether the author regards existence to be the basis of value, or values to be the measure of reality for all existents.

In spite of these difficulties the book represents a serious and devout survey of the contributions of rational and moral considerations to the understanding of the great Christian doctrines. Empirical theology is a not-to-be-neglected part of total Christian thought, alongside the recent resurgence of attention to the biblical, dogmatic, and traditional theological emphases.

GERALD O. McCULLOH

Director of the Department of Theological Schools, Division of Educational Institutions, the General Board of Education, The Methodist Church, Nashville, Tennessee.

Conscience and Compromise. By EDWARD LEROY LONG, JR. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954. 166 pp. \$3.00.

The tensions of discipleship are inescapable. On the one hand the Christian reads the simple imperatives of the Sermon on the Mount; on the other he faces a secular society infinitely complex in its character and definitely sub-Christian in its standards. How can he be loyal to the first amid the circumstances created by the second? "It is not easy," as Dr. Long remarks, "to be a Christian in an un-Christian world" (p. 13).

The problem is intensely contemporary, yet as old as Christian history. It is strange, therefore, that we so often disregard the insights of the past. Christians have not always been so naïve as to believe that you really solve the practical difficulties of perplexed people by telling them to do "what Jesus would want you to do." The careful attempt to relate the absolutes of the Gospel to the contingencies of time has had an honorable place in the history of Christian moral theory. In past centuries and in all branches of the church the duty of providing practical guidance was seriously accepted. Jeremy Taylor in his *Ductor Dubitantium* and Richard Baxter in his *Christian Directory* provide excellent examples of the detailed care and the searching psychological insight that the ablest men brought to this task. In the light of modern circumstances their precise instructions may not always seem acceptable; what is immensely impressive is the moral realism with which they faced the actual problems of daily life.

The name by which this honorable and necessary discipline was known was "casuistry." Like many another good word it has since been corrupted by bad associations, and now bears a thoroughly evil meaning. To modern ears it suggests a completely dishonest and disingenuous evasion of moral responsibilities. To recover its original meaning and restore the word to its rightful place in the Christian vocabulary is one of Dr. Long's immediate objectives. He is interested in the word, however, merely because he is profoundly impressed with the importance of the activity. Casuistry represents a necessary means by which the Christian learns to live effectively in the society of which he forms a part.

In the long run Dr. Long's advocacy of this particular word may prove to be one of the weakest parts of his work. Readers may well feel that "casuistry" is now too deeply tainted to be profitably redeemed. When common usage has acquiesced in its corruption, to resuscitate the sense it still bore three hundred years ago would mean at best that theology had acquired another term used by the experts in a way utterly bewildering to the uninitiated. It may be remarked in passing that Dr. Long proves most vulnerable when he is intent on providing a historical justification for the term he proposes to use. To speak about "the medieval Jesuits" (p. 24, also p. 26) is a contradiction in terms. The Middle Ages had ended before Ignatius Loyola was born: the Society of Jesus is a phenomenon of the Counter-Reformation, not of "the medieval period." Or again, to contrast Perkins as an Anglican with Baxter as a Puritan obscures the fact that to Baxter himself, and to all others of like outlook, Perkins was one of the greatest advocates of the Puritan attitude.

These defects are the more unfortunate because Dr. Long presents his essential contentions with great care and cogency. The notable feature of his book is the discriminating exactitude with which he points out the dangers to left and right of the narrow path which the Christian must walk. Perfectionism represents as serious a deviation from effective discipleship as the spirit which accommodates itself

without protest to the standards of society. It is impossible for the Christian to live in our world without compromise. It is supremely important, therefore, that he should understand the dynamics of the process. He must realize what he is doing—and why. He must learn to recognize the unavowed compromises which often vitiate the Christian witness, and he must master the difficult art of keeping in fruitful tension "the proximate strategies and the ultimate principles of Christian ethics" (p. 87).

The section of the work dealing with "the Structure of Casuistry" sets forth the basic character of this inescapable problem with great skill, insight, and ingenuity. The chapters on "the Content of Casuistry" inevitably seem slighter in character. The author has no alternative save to deal by suggestion and inference with areas in which complex problems invite detailed discussion. In older manuals the task of giving specific guidance was resolutely faced, but it is necessary to remember that Baxter's *Christian Directory* is thirty times the size of Dr. Long's book. In any case, it is of the essence of the casuistic method that individuals be taught to practice it; once they have mastered the principles they can solve the specific problems for themselves.

While insisting that compromises are inescapable, Dr. Long sets the whole discussion in a framework large enough to preserve its essential significance. The ethical adjustments we are compelled to make are saved from the serious perils which beset them when we place them firmly in a perspective wide enough to deliver them from petty expediency. Casuistry must be disciplined and controlled by the absolutes inherent in an ethic of love, which in turn must be firmly rooted in an unshakable faith in God. Thus, by providing a graduated and ascending scale of reference, the author shows how to relate the immediate tasks we face to the ultimate convictions we hold. We struggle with immediate perplexities, but we endure "as seeing him who is invisible."

The subject is obviously so vast that a work on this scale can hope merely to indicate its general character. This it achieves with unusual success. We can be sincerely grateful to Dr. Long for his resolute insistence that we must deal realistically with actual problems in our contemporary world, yet do so in unfaltering loyalty to Christian standards. It is the firm grasp both of the immediate difficulties and of the abiding ultimates that makes this book an encouraging phenomenon. It will be a happy day when the church has learned to keep the perceptions of theology in fruitful contact with the issues of daily conduct.

GERALD R. CRAGG

Erskine and American United Church, Montreal, Canada.

Christianity, Diplomacy, and War. By HERBERT BUTTERFIELD. New York: The Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953. 125 pp. \$1.75.

This essay is an urbane but devastating attack on "ideological diplomacy" and "wars for righteousness," written from the standpoint of a Christian realism which accepts the fact of power and tries (in the author's words) to "steal a march" on it, rather than ignoring it or explaining it away. The author, who is professor of modern history at Cambridge University, takes somewhat the same tough-minded Christian approach to political problems that is represented in this country by George Kennan and Reinhold Niebuhr. In the series of brilliantly-written essays which have come from his pen during the past twenty years, Butterfield has been saying that it is exceedingly dangerous to make moral judgments on historical movements and

causes, that self-righteousness and moralism are relatively more to be feared than disillusion and cynicism, that "holy wars" are the worst wars, and that Christian humility and love are the strongest solvents of the hard ideological hatreds of the modern world.

In this book he develops the thesis that Christians in search of a strategy have much to learn from the international order and limited warfare of the eighteenth century. Somewhat like John U. Nef in his recent book *War and Human Progress*, Butterfield credits the diplomats of two centuries ago with a great achievement: the development of a diplomatic code which put peace before righteousness, maintained an equilibrium of power, preserved the existence of small political units, and never allowed wars to proceed to total destruction and "unconditional surrender" of any belligerent.

This achievement was not the result of impersonal forces. It was a remedy for two centuries of bitter and unlimited religious strife, a remedy consciously devised by civilized men still within a Christian tradition. The parallel between the religious hatreds of the sixteenth century and the ideological hatreds of the twentieth is close. If we can learn to see ourselves as others see us, to renounce the luxury of being judges in our own case, to recognize that the real issue between the USA and the USSR is one of power, not of ideology, to give up the "war for righteousness," and to accept a balancing of power in our world, then (says Butterfield) we might build a peace which could "evoke new moods and release a million spontaneities in the world." In the age-old competition between "peace" and "righteousness" for the favor of men, there is no question where Butterfield stands.

The temperature of this little book will be too cool for the emotional comfort of either the pacifist or the "righteousness" wing of contemporary Christianity. Nor will it be easy for the parish minister to get a good rousing sermon out of it. Occasionally the argument is strained, occasionally repetitious. But to the present reviewer this is the most penetrating and constructive Christian treatment of the subject since the War. Mr. Dulles should have a copy of it by his bedside.

E. HARRIS HARBISON

Professor of History, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.

Psychology of Pastoral Care. By PAUL E. JOHNSON. New York: The Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953. 362 pp. \$4.75.

The Christian pastoral office is a rare and rich opportunity. It is also an incredibly difficult task—never more so than today. At the same time, the practical resources for such a task are being multiplied and the task itself is being made more productive as the newer insights of modern depth psychology and psychotherapy are being freely appropriated and applied to the traditional wisdoms of the Christian "cure of souls." New tillage of this old field proceeds apace. Books and articles pour down like a torrent on the conscientious bibliographer. The perfectionist who waits to speak until he is fully competent toils on in silence. And, if an earnest pastor were to read half the stuff available, his pastoral work would suffer—and we should have a new kind of bookworm in the ministry!

In such a teeming field, it is a very useful thing to have a general, comprehensive survey of the whole terrain. It is needful to see the pastor's business steadily and whole, and to have all the major problems of pastoral care interpreted from a definite psychological and theological perspective. This is the chief value of Professor John-

son's latest book. It has a clear and very definite standpoint—"Boston personalism" and "Rogerian" psychology—and it does serve as an admirable introduction to all the basic problems of pastoral care. Well-trained pastors and professional counselors may not find very much that is new in the book—except in the theoretical section, where they may also find a good deal to argue about. But theological students looking toward the pastorate, pastors who have never fully considered what it is they do, and professional counselors who see the pastor's work from the too-narrow perspective of the clinic—these, and many others, will profit greatly from this comprehensive analysis of and prescription for an effective, "person-centered" pastoral ministry.

This is a strongly affirmative book—and a highly idealistic one. "The love of humanity and the sense of identification with every human interest is the basic condition" (p. 38-9) of productive pastoral work. The good pastor is noncondemnatory, consistently appreciative and respectful, nondefensive and responsive. He is able "to accept the evil with the good as genuine though misguided effort to fill actual needs, which though distorted in misfortune and evil, arise from a deep hunger for life values" (p. 39). "He is, so far as possible, to do the work of Jesus [in his congregation], to incarnate to his utmost capacity the spirit of forgiving love into his personal life, and to incorporate as faithfully and as resourcefully as may be the practice of such love in all relationships of the community" (p. 40). These quotations are fairly typical of Johnson's style and his theological perspective.

The most helpful parts of the book for the pastoral reader, I should think, are the chapters on marriage and family counseling and the chapter "On Meeting Death." The analysis of how love grows between persons and guides the growth of persons in a good family is discerning, warmhearted, and "practical" in the very best sense. The discussion of the pastor's opportunity in bereavement and grief is particularly helpful. Another useful contribution which the book renders—again especially to beginners—is an extensive bibliography and two appendices giving the officially approved "Standards for the Work of the Chaplain in the General Hospital" and "Standards for Clinical Pastoral Education." These later are important guidelines both for those seeking adequate training for themselves and for administrators who need to know how to judge professional qualifications in these fields.

The least impressive parts of the book are those which touch on theory, both psychological and metaphysical. Rogerian therapy is having a great vogue among pastoral counselors nowadays, in spite of its general disfavor among many medical psychiatrists and the psychoanalysts. One of their basic objections is that nondirective therapy seeks, on principle, to eliminate or minimize the general phenomenon of *transference*; whereas all therapeutic doctrines which stand anywhere in the general Freudian tradition agree that *transference-phenomena* and their handling constitute the most crucial aspects of therapy—and of interpersonal relations in general. Johnson rightly rejects the authoritarian role of the pastor, but, on the other side, he tends to neglect the actual *transference-phenomena* which inevitably emerge in pastoral counseling, and which must actually be handled—skillfully or unskillfully—by every pastoral counselor. This is a very complex issue and deserves much further exploration.

Johnson rejects the authoritarian pattern, and yet his idealistic picture of the good pastor might easily be anxiety-generating for the eager and conscientious. The good pastor must be nonauthoritarian; he should be unfailingly permissive; he ought to be constantly loving. (He ought also, apparently, be omnipresent—if you calculate the actual schedule required to serve a standard-size congregation by Johnson's

specifications!) One wonders if a young pastor, confronted by such an ideal image, might not fall victim to an anxious "tyranny of the shoulds" (a phrase of Karen Horney's).

It may be no more than the natural cantankerousness of a theologian (*odium theologicum*) that prompts one to criticize Johnson's brief essay in Christian metaphysics. Surely his recognition of the need for an adequate doctrinal setting for the practical principles of pastoral care is to be heartily approved. But there is still much to question about the adequacy of the doctrinal framework which he has provided in this book. On the one hand, Johnson has hardly plumbed the full resources of his own personalistic tradition and, on the other, he has scarcely faced the most serious difficulties in that tradition. For example: "God appears to be a Person-in-Relationships, whose inexhaustible love is creating and sustaining a universal community where persons may communicate significant meanings and interchange productive values" (p. 323). But does this not make God "a member of a class"—and are there not notorious defects in such a conception of *God*? It is interesting that the only theologian, outside the personalistic tradition, whom Johnson cites with real approval is Paul Tillich. How, then, does he explain Tillich's decisive rejection of "personality" as an adequate category for conceiving God and his earnest contention, in *The Courage to Be*, that "theism" (the idea of God as a Person) must be "transcended"?

It is important to observe how neatly Johnson's highly favorable estimate of the human situation, his rather casual view of the human quandary, and his "Pelagian" views of grace and human ability all follow from and fit into his "liberal" doctrines of God, Jesus Christ, and human salvation. Is this theological position the one best suited to the appropriating of the practical wisdom of modern psychotherapy to "the psychology of pastoral care"? The answer to this question is one of the most urgent and interesting problems in contemporary theology.

ALBERT C. OUTLER

Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

Sex Ethics and the Kinsey Reports. By SEWARD HILTNER. New York: Association Press, 1953. xi-238 pp. \$3.00.

The two Kinsey Reports upon the Sexual Behavior of the Male and Female respectively, are long (about 800 pages each) and somewhat tedious to read, from the point of view of the general, or even the seriously interested, reader. Dr. Hiltner's book, which is quite short, presumably is written both as an introduction to the material contained within the Kinsey volumes and also as an explanation of the relevance of this material to the Christian and responsible reader.

Dr. Hiltner, so he explicitly states in the preface, is "a theologian." His own "concern about sex is ethical in nature and Christian in context," and represents "only part of" his "professional interests." His especial field of interest is to explore what he calls "the personality sciences for the light they contribute to theological understanding and religious practice."

From this standpoint of interest, Dr. Hiltner sets out to mediate between Mr. Kinsey and his readers and critics, particularly those who—presumably—would share the author's own religious presuppositions. In the compass of eleven short chapters and 238 pages, he manages to include quite a lot. There is an excellent introductory chapter on the Christian view of sex, followed by one entitled "a contemporary

statement of the Christian view of sex," which is Dr. Hiltner's own presentation in the context of Christian anthropology. The following chapters, after introducing the reader to Mr. Kinsey's aim and methods, deal with such aspects of the whole subject as premarital and extramarital intercourse, masturbation, petting, and homosexuality. These subjects are discussed on the basis of Mr. Kinsey's analyses and findings—discussed, summarized, and explained. After this quite sympathetic presentation, the author proceeds to examine Mr. Kinsey's category of religious background. Here we discover a note of criticism, which becomes quite explicit at the end of Chapter Seven.

The two next chapters present categories of analysis and criticism which are Dr. Hiltner's own original contribution to the subject. Existing attitudes toward sex he sees as falling into six categories. These are respectively described as "the child-of-nature attitude"; "the respectability-restraint attitude"; "the romantic attitude"; "the toleration attitude"; "the no-harm attitude"; and, finally, "the personal-interpersonal attitude." The first three are regarded as corresponding more or less to Mr. Kinsey's socio-educational categories of grade-school, high-school, and college-groups. These six categories, so the author explains, are "organic in nature." It is not quite clear to this reviewer what the adjective "organic" here means. We are told that "every item or fact within it [i.e., the attitude] is bound dynamically to every other item or fact." Dr. Hiltner obviously is attached to these categories, for he tells us that "this assertion of the organic nature of each attitude is, if true at all, of the very greatest importance for own understanding of sex." Be that as it may, the fact remains that some arrangements of facts or ideas never seem so important or satisfactory to some people as to others. To many readers, particularly those with a respect for the English language, Dr. Hiltner's categories with their adjectival use of nouns might be quite irritating.

After this presentation of his categories, he proceeds in the next chapter to review them from the standpoint of the Christian view of sex. As might be guessed ahead of time, the Christian view approves most of the personal-interpersonal attitude toward sex. "The personal-interpersonal attitude is the best implementation in attitudinal terms of the Christian view." All the other attitudes, as also might be guessed ahead of time, are weighed and found wanting by the Christian view, because in one way or another the criticized view does not embody the realization of, and respect for, the full personal being of man or woman.

Having brought his readers thus far, in his final chapter Dr. Hiltner intensifies his mediating role, and shows first that the Christian view of sex can be and should be relevant for the needs of life today. Then, he describes what he calls Mr. Kinsey's "challenge to the Christian view." This he finds in the fact that Mr. Kinsey interprets Christianity as legalistic, moralistic, and prurient, and, if he so interprets it, it is because often it has been so, and still is. No doubt many Christians would agree that much of historic Christianity has been extremely un-Christian or sub-Christian with regard to the whole subject of sex. But many also will doubt Dr. Hiltner's assumption that we need Mr. Kinsey to tell us this. His gratitude to Mr. Kinsey for having taken, along with Havelock Ellis and Freud, "the lid off" sex seems to prevent him from being really critical of any errors or fallacies in the Kinsey volumes.

There are sociologists and social psychologists who have criticized the Kinsey volumes on the basis of their own disciplines. They note, for example, the resistance in the Reports to any understanding of the human and social elements in the sex

relationship. Sociologists who are interested in the status of the family in our society do not accept criteria of normality and naturalness derived from the zoological field. In fact, it has been suggested that Mr. Kinsey confuses scientific objectivity with his own (subjectively motivated) special interests.

There also are psychiatrists and psychologists who criticize the exclusively biological context of the whole enquiry. Thus, Dr. Karl Menninger in his critical appraisal of the second volume, which was published last autumn in the Saturday Review of Literature, challenged Mr. Kinsey's conception of sex as something to be "let out." (Mr. Kinsey uses the word "outlet" for the specific sex act.) Dr. Menninger also notes that this conception of sex involves two further errors; namely, that the more "outlet" there is (one is tempted to substitute the word "output"), the better; and secondly, the emphasis upon orgasm as "the total goal and ultimate criterion of sexual satisfaction." As Dr. Menninger remarks, "a kiss by Judas is one thing, a kiss by Venus is another, and a kiss by a loving mother another." As kisses vary in quality and context of meaning, so do orgasms. "They may add up to the same numbers on an adding machine, but they do not add up to significant totals in human life."

Sociologists, psychiatrists, literary men and teachers have helped the responsible reader to analyze the implicit presuppositions and to note fallacies in argument and conclusion. One of the most telling as also well-written criticisms was an essay by Lionel Trilling later published in his volume, *The Liberal Imagination*. Compared with such treatments, that of Dr. Hiltner, who after all describes himself as a Christian theologian, is very uncritical. On the basis of his own presuppositions, this lack of question seems for some of his readers somewhat questionable. Why does he walk thus delicately?

URSULA M. NIEBUHR

Department of Religion, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City.

Hunted Heretic: The Life and Death of Michael Servetus, 1511-1553.

By ROLAND H. BANTON. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1953. xii-270 pp. \$3.75.

Hugh Latimer. By HAROLD S. DARBY. London: Epworth Press; Chicago, Alec R. Allenson, 1953. 262 pp. \$5.00.

Within two years two men died for their faith in the midst of flames. That either should have wasted much sympathy on the predicament of the other is quite unlikely. Hugh Latimer died on charges of heresy concerning mainly the Lord's Supper. Michael Servetus died for a variety of reasons, but chiefly on the charge of antitrinitarianism. Throughout his life the latter was staunchly on the side of toleration for dissident opinion—although himself disputatious—whereas the former at least once preached lugubriously beside the pile of faggots as one of the victims of Henry VIII awaited his fate. Latimer would probably have been happy under the Elizabethan Settlement. Servetus would have found such compromise and ambiguity intolerable to his keenly rational mind. If they had anything in common it was hatred of superstition.

The two books under consideration here present biographically and dramatically some of the issues fought out in the religious controversies of the sixteenth century. They both possess added merit through attention to the environment of thought and action in which those two men moved.

Latimer began his career under Henry VIII, to whom he became court preacher

and from whom he received the diocese of Worcester. It is interesting, in the light of his vigorous support of reform, that his three predecessors were Italians. Darby has given emphasis to the significance of his hero in the Henrician period, while the Reformation in England was still nascent. The bishop preached before the king during the Reformation Parliament of 1534, and occupied the episcopal office during the dissolution of the monasteries. Although later, under the Six Acts, he resigned the episcopacy and yet dared preach strong sermons for reform, he showed himself an Erastian: "God give us all grace to yield due thanks to our Lord God, God of England! for verily he hath showed himself God of England, or rather an English God. . . ." He did not return to the episcopal office under Edward VI, but nevertheless exerted broad influence as a preacher close to Cranmer.

The English author, who has since died, has defined Latimer as pre-eminently a great preacher. He spoke clearly on issues of the day with his immediate congregation in mind. People flocked together when word went about that Dr. Latimer was to preach. Darby recommends especially the full series of seven Lenten sermons for the year 1549. The conclusion portrays a pathetic figure, seventy years old, long since worn out, unready for drama and disputation but almost eager for martyrdom long deferred. Perhaps the memory of "Little Bilney," who had started his thought toward reformation, was vivid to him as he and Ridley lighted their candle. The inadequate bibliography and index give no fair measure of the diligence of research demonstrated by the full references to sources. This book by a preacher about a preacher fills a gap in English religious biography.

The work on Servetus by Bainton deals in masterly fashion with the many-faceted character of the most famous victim of John Calvin. One finds here not only his life story but a picture of the times that produced the spirit of persecution. Nowhere is the ambivalent nature of the sixteenth century more in evidence. Strange concatenations of the medieval and modern, the scholastic and humanistic, gather around the figure of Servetus. And the author has caught both sides of the times and of the man. One of the most delightful parts of this new book is the "Foreword," in which the author explains the long delay in bringing to print material gathered under a grant from the Guggenheim Foundation in 1926. "The postponement was due to the differences between books and babies," the former, once born, not being subject to improvement. His reticence has paid dividends, as the mature judgment found in all his works indicates. *Hunted Heretic* represents the culmination of a long series of studies dealing with figures of the Reformation, the others being David Joris, Bernardino Ochino, and Sebastian Castellio. Here is presented the story of a man who became a central figure in the struggle for religious liberty, a man remarkably modern in contrast to the sturdy medieval figures of Luther and Calvin. He was not only a theologian, but also a physician, geographer, and humanist. He was also a heretic, in the eyes of the Inquisition in France and of Calvin in Geneva.

Bainton, by judicious quotation and effective dramatization, has put one more significant leader on the stage of the Reformation, for too long dominated by the Greats. Incidentally, Servetus is exonerated from the charge of conspiracy with the Libertines in Geneva. The numerous black-and-white illustrations, mainly from woodcuts of the period, reflect the Bainton touch, as do the forty-four pages of bibliography and footnotes, a tribute not only to the scholarship of the author but also to the integrity and patience of the publishers.

FREDERICK A. NORWOOD

Associate Professor of Church History, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

The Church and Social Responsibility. Edited by J. RICHARD SPANN. New York: The Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953. 272 pp. \$2.75.

Most reviews of a symposium are inclined to describe the work as "uneven." But it is well to recognize that the social situation is at the same time both complex and uneven, and any accurate appraisal of the social responsibility of the church must necessarily reflect the facts. With this in mind it is possible to be enthusiastic about this volume. The state of our world lends itself admirably to symposium treatment. It is too varied and complex for anyone to be an authority on every aspect of the problem. And here is a panel of experts who are qualified to bring anyone up to date on contemporary social issues. Here is a much needed refresher course for those who have become confused in this era of suspicion, hysteria, and name-calling, as well as for those who are "weary in well doing" or have become preoccupied in the enjoyment of cold war prosperity.

The book helps put solid ground under the feet of those who wish to move forward in social progress and who feel a concern that all is not right in the human relationships of this present world. It is likely that anyone with a special field of social interest may feel the lack of adequate treatment and in some cases of factual data to support conclusions. In a year when legislative committees have invaded an area ordinarily respected for freedom of religious utterance, one could have wished for a chapter on that specific subject by an equally well-qualified observer. The issue of course is mentioned in passing very effectively by S. Paul Schilling in his contributed article entitled "Rights, Freedoms and Responsibilities," as follows: "In society at large the plight of freedom is more precarious than at any other period in modern times. Even in the United States liberties are denied, restricted, or watered down in the name of national security. Men who exercise independent and critical judgment must not be labeled subversive or have their reputations jeopardized by sweeping, unsubstantiated charges, with no adequate opportunity for factual reply."

The chapter on "Race Relations and Civil Rights" by Walter W. Sikes is at once factual, temperate, and extremely well written. It is not the usual tirade against a section, to which the sensitive take justifiable exception. There is reason given for heart searching by those who live in many areas of this earth's surface. The whole field is surveyed in a way to unsettle our all too easy adjustment to unjust conditions.

Another outstanding contribution is that of Eddy Asirvatham on "World Economic Problems." It brings up to date the famous statement of Bishop Thoburn concerning the basis of enduring peace. This stirring challenge heard as a student at Ohio Wesleyan University caused Ralph E. Diffendorfer to dedicate his life in service which ultimately qualified him as one of the few to deserve the title "Missionary Statesman." The story of Horace Holmes, the Point IV administrator of the United States in India, is told most effectively and deserves wide retelling. One is tempted to quote many searching statements, of which the following are examples: "In all that it does the church should work with the people and not simply for the people." "No mere man-made economic system can succeed unless it has sound character behind it." "It is time that the rank and file realized that if Communism makes its seductive appeal to many in the underdeveloped areas, it is largely because of abject poverty, the continuance of imperialism and colonial exploitation, of war, racialism and unbridled forms of capitalism. If Communism is to be effectively checked, the church should take the initiative in combating idea by idea, plan by

plan, and program by program; and not idea by emotion, plan by platitude, and program by a vision in the sky."

Perhaps it is because this reviewer has been involved in matters of possible church relocation that the chapter on "The Prevention and Treatment of Crime" by L. Harold DeWolf made such a strong appeal. For instance, "One of the most alarming present trends in American Protestantism is the tendency to withdraw our churches from the rooming-house areas of our cities, where the needs are most acute, and to concentrate in the more prosperous and stable suburbs." Probably every reader will find some such discussion by a competent authority in his own particular area of interest or need. Mention has been made of the lack of adequate treatment of the problem of civil and religious liberties. Other areas not treated adequately have to do with liquor, gambling, and the matter of church-state relationship including the perennial differences in approach which cause conflict between Protestant and Roman Catholic. Anson Phelps Stokes has an excellent chapter by the title of "The Church and State," and no doubt his larger work meets the issue; but this brief statement doesn't seem to get off the ground at the point where the average person needs help. And I suppose it was thought that the liquor issue has been pretty well covered in other books; but something of the same type of treatment given to that problem here as to the other issues would be helpful to many who need a renewed stimulus to more effective activity in the interests of sobriety. It is generally taken for granted that Christian people will be opposed to gambling, but from where I stand it would appear that some printed resources would be helpful. The editor indicates that some other contributors might have participated in this symposium if their schedules had enabled them to meet the deadline. But as far as it goes, the treatment of the fifteen issues to my mind is excellent and I heartily commend the book.

I have not done justice to the articles by Walter Muelder, Roland Bainton, Walter Van Kirk, and Oren Baker which are equally outstanding. The quality of their work is so well and favorably known that it is necessary only to mention the fact that their participation is up to standard. The book includes an adequate but not exhaustive bibliography on the lines of a suggested curriculum for education in Christian Social Action. There are biographical notes and a good index. The book deserves wide reading and application.

LOYD F. WORLEY

The First Methodist Church, Hartford, Connecticut.

God Hidden and Revealed. By JOHN DILLENBERGER. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1953. xxiv-193 pp. \$2.50.

It sometimes happens that a revolution takes place in theological thinking in virtue of which entire structures are fractured. So massively, however, do conventional ways of discourse overlay ways of thought and speech that these cracks at the center are for centuries not apparent.

The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century was more and deeper than a protest of piety, a recovery of the authority of the Evangel, an ecclesiological and social shift of power. Basic to the entire epoch, central to its leading personalities and determinative of its theology was the perception of a *way of revelation*. This revelatory way of God could no longer be made to live with scholastic methods of description, discovered a central estrangement between the gospel and all forms of

philosophy, and made it necessary thereafter for Christian theology to fashion categories which should be derived from the sharp particularity of the biblical speech about God and man.

Luther saw this, and operated according to what he saw. But the continuity of his truly Catholic piety, his terminology, and to a degree his overt theological methods with the venerable church prevented the central dislocation from becoming as apparent in his day as it actually was. And we are the belated heirs of that work.

The problem may be stated thus: The disclosures of God to man is always directed toward a restoration of man to God in *faith*. Now faith is never a work of the Spirit of God that can bring a man home undamaged! Something must be broken, a false trust must be shattered before it can be replaced with another, native religiousness must be made bankrupt before it can be replaced and its needs realized by a theonomous religiousness. The revelation of God to man, therefore, has always the character of something contrary. It is a scandal, a possibility that can only live as a possibility by the destruction of possibilities that hold the field. Therefore, says Luther, when God would save us he does it by condemning us; he makes us alive by killing us; he shows forth the highest in the most despised.

The perception of the closeness with which this contrary character of revelation hugs the salvatory narrative is what moved Luther to speak of his theology as *Theologia Crucis*. The eternal God is a child of time born of a peasant girl, the King on a donkey, life being done to death, the world-as-Procurator sentencing the deed of the Creator to death. It is necessary for faith that the central things of God should be hidden from sense and sight.

It is the particular excellence of Dr. Dillenberger's book that it makes this point in the context of a close, competent, historically sophisticated inquiry into the doctrine of revelation. The importance of this book resides in the fact that we have at long last an open acknowledgement of a nuclear cleavage that underlies divisions in our contemporary theological discourse. But the knowing reader will find it; others will fall off at one of the several difficult turns in the first chapter and will never get far enough to find themselves in serious trouble.

JOSEPH SITTLER

Professor of Systematic Theology, Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Illinois.

Faith and Culture. By BERNARD EUGENE MELAND. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953. ix-229 pp. \$3.75.

This book contains the honest attempt of a "liberal" theologian to overcome his intellectualism and to penetrate into the inner core of the Christian faith. However, the shell of his basic Whiteheadianism makes this undertaking somewhat dubious and even frustrates it. The discussion moves in a no man's land between genuine philosophy and genuine theology without clarifying the issues involved. I am not sure whether the author adapts himself to the scientism of that school in order to win over those who are trapped by its biologistic speculation, or whether he himself is still under the spell of a pseudoscientific metaphysics, as many utterances seem to indicate.

In any case we must welcome the open break with a "liberalism" that did not understand and appreciate the significance and profundity of the biblical message. This book at least tries to vindicate to faith what is of the faith. It arouses hopes

that even theologians will recognize in the end what the Christian believer always knew and knows, that faith is concerned with a dimension of its own which precludes all rationalistic and naturalistic, all moralistic and psychological interpretation.

However, this basic insight is obscured in many ways. The author falls victim to the confusion of spiritual and poetical imagination (e.g., p. 42). He yields to a historicism which deprives Christianity of its transhistorical meaning ("Christ . . . points not beyond history, but back to the formative events of history," p. 87). Throughout he proclaims the primacy not of faith, but of culture, and deals with the content of faith as a myth not essentially different from the contents of pagan religion.

The author defines God as "the transcendent structure of sensitivity and meaning" (p. 215). I do not think that our philosophical or theological knowledge is thereby essentially increased, improved, or corrected. The author regards his "philosophy" as highly superior to that of Kant. But is not Kant's definition of God as "the holy author of nature" and as "the supreme lawgiver, judge and administrator in a moral community," moralistically tinged though it is, infinitely better and even more in line with biblical revelation than that of the author?

It is obvious that the "new" or "critical liberalism" which the author now claims to hold, is most strongly influenced by the so-called neo-orthodoxy of Reinhold Niebuhr. But the author recognizes this source only grudgingly and with a fault-finding disposition. Indeed, he has not yet fully embraced the prophetic thought of this great American theologian. There is a long way from Whitehead to an authentic Christian view. Perhaps the words the author uses with respect to William James may with equal right be applied to himself: "It is possible that James was too much of the scientist to deal sensitively with the insight that he had come upon."

RICHARD J. KRONER

School of Theology, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

That Immortal Sea. By LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954. 217 pp. \$2.50.

Dr. Weatherhead, who has been touring our country in recent weeks, has added another to the list of his books. He gets his title from Wordsworth's line, "That immortal sea which brought us hither," and the book reflects the infinite longings which well up eternally in the human spirit. Preached to City Temple audiences during the past few months, these sermons together represent Weatherhead at his best, as he speaks of hope and faith in a trying age. His subjects include "The Advantages of Atheism," "Which Voice Shall I Trust?" "This Haunted World," "Christ's Unconventional Love," "I Couldn't Care Less," "Let's Not Be Disgusted With Ourselves," "The Last of Life." The author is one of the most widely read religious writers of our time, and this book keeps up his high standard. Ministers and laymen alike will find in these sermons both content and inspiration.

NOLAN B. HARMON

Editor, RELIGION IN LIFE.

Book Notices

Paul Tillich has a small new volume, *Love Power, and Justice* (Oxford University Press, \$2.50), which analyzes these concepts ontologically, seeks to clarify the "problems, confusions and ambiguities" which attend discussion of them, and comes out with implications for ethics and theology. The book has kinship with the previous volume, *The Courage to Be*. The Philosophical Library has published a volume of Karl Barth's shorter writings, 1946-1952, entitled *Against the Stream* (\$3.75). "While the preponderance of interest is on political questions—and in particular on the political issue between East and West—the framework of Barth's thought is unyieldingly Christian, and indeed Christocentric."

The God in You, by Kermit Eby (union organizer, preacher, university professor), is a brief, vigorous little book combining biography with reflection on the grave moral problems of the present: "the attempt of a Brethren boy to reconcile his heritage and the world in which he now is." Chicago University Press, \$2.50. This same press has given us *Higher Education and the Human Spirit*, by Bernard E. Meland, at \$4.00. As in all his books, he combines a humanistic approach with spiritual sensitivity. He is concerned that institutions of higher learning should teach the supplementing of critical thought by "disciplined imagination, a more sensitive, experimental reach into these subtle and profound areas of experience"—the poetic, the artistic, the religious.

Bishop Gerald Kennedy has compiled *A Reader's Notebook*, a commodious and highly useful "anthology of illustrations for preachers and other public speakers, drawn from a wide variety of sources, both classic and contemporary"—well indexed. (Harper, \$3.95.) The beloved interracial leader Howard Thurman, now Dean of the Chapel and Professor at Boston University, has a luminous book, *Meditations of the Heart*, which he calls "Volume II of *Deep Is the Hunger*." (Harper, \$2.75.) A third fine Harper book is Willard L. Sperry, *Sermons Preached at Harvard* (\$2.00). "Many, if not most, of these sermons have been consciously or unconsciously addressed to this widespread skepticism in college circles," "the somber dread that human life may be merely meaningless."

The World Christ Knew, by the late Canon Anthony Deane, first published in Britain in the thirties and selling widely overseas, has been published in America for the first time in 1953 by the Michigan State College Press, East Lansing, Michigan. Scholarly but thoroughly readable, the book gives "an admirable description of the social, political and religious condition of Palestine at the time of Christ's birth." \$2.00.

A new book club for teen-agers—the Young People's Religious Bookshelf—has been launched by Simon Doniger, editor of the monthly *Pastoral Psychology*, 159 Northern Boulevard, Great Neck, N. Y. The major emphasis will be on religious books, but others will be included "such as inspirational biographies of great men as well as holy men; inspiring stories of adventure . . . psychological books on self-understanding and other problems . . . and occasionally fiction of high value." The Advisory Board includes Bishop H. K. Sherrill, Bishop H. G. Werner, R. C. Miller, Bonaro Overstreet, George Corwin, D. A. Poling. The Club's first selection: J. Edward Lantz, *Stories to Grow By* (Association Press). Premium for joining: the Nelson Illustrated Bible.

E. H. L.

ii
fy
nd
he
a
m
in
n's

o-
he
ile
O.
rd
th
ld
re

us
rs,
d.
of
ns
(.)
(.)
d-
at

ed
ca
n.
he
o.

ty,
on
eat
on
t."
C.
ec-
for